

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_79049
Title of the Manuscript:	IMPACT OF DIFFERENT INPUT SOURCES ON NUTRIENT UPTAKE OF CORIANDER
Type of the Article	

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalijecc.com/index.php/IJECC/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, corrects the manuscript and highlights that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The topic surely looked simple, but would have left the reader with many lingering questions; ideally it should be both short and concise. I suggest you reframe it. For eg, input sources is too broad, it is better if you specify it. Also, I would like to suggest you add the location, or the soil type, or the cropping system, or even all, or as the case might. The main aim is the specificity of the title. 2. Your abstract is within the range of 250-300 words, which is good. However, it did not conform with standard of writing abstract. Please review your abstract to show the followings, and brief as possible: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Background, why it is necessary to carry out this research, in other words, what is the existing problem, leading to the research? b. Objective: which you did already in the first sentence of your current abstract. c. Materials and methods: more importantly introduce your fertilizer treatment. Because by present I don't know what your treatments are, but you started mentioning this is higher or lower than this. d. Results, and e. Conclusion(s) and/or recommendation(s). 3. Line 23: This section is completely missing, give a maximum of 5 keywords relating to you work, this is for indexing and it helps readers discover your work easily. 4. Line 25-58: You have taken a long-time over emphasizing the economic importance of the plant, but at the end of the paragraph I could not see any knowledge gap. Please, re-write this segment in 5-6 lines, stating all the necessary citations or literature. 5. Line 59-70: How does this part relate to your work? Delete 6. Line 71-78: This part also of no relevance, delete it please. 7. Line 87-90: Is this the main focus of your research, if no delete it. 8. Line 24: You have succeeded in bulking your introduction, however, the main conceptual idea or frame work is not clear. I expect to see: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. A brief background of the plant, relating it to nutrients requirements and current fertilization scheme, then show the knowledge gap. b. After showing the current trend in the fertilization, relate it to the modification with manure or organic amendment, by a way of comparison, show the knowledge there as well. c. Your introduction should maximally not be more than 800 words. 9. Line 95-98: a part from the aforesaid information, it is better you provide information about both climatic and soil factor, eg temperature, rainfall, humidity, soil type, soil classification (if any) and state whether the experimental site is short term or long-term station. If it is long-term research station, you need in addition to the above, provide the initial soil properties. 10. Line 100-105: Apply same pattern T1 (FYM 20t/ha + 100% RDF) to the other treatments: T2-T12 (). 11. Line 107-110: This information should be provided under the heading "Description of the study area" 12. Line 116: In addition to this, you need to specify the sources of these manure, rates of 	

Review Form 1.6

	<p>application, type and mode of application and any other relevant information like demarcation of the plots etc.</p> <p>13. Line 155-156: This is an unconventional way of presenting scientific tables, see the modification I made apply same to all your tables</p> <p>14. Line 159: Under this caption provide some information on how you go about calculating the nutrients uptake, because by present I don't know how?</p> <p>15. Line 160: Under this heading please specify how you analyze your data statistically.</p> <p>16. Line 175-177: it is not enough to mention agree or nor agree, as a researcher you need to go further explain the possible reasons for the outcome of your results and support it with relevant literature. But, by present I cannot see your "DISCUSSION". This should apply to all other sections, please!</p> <p>17. Line 235: This very important segment is missing, why? Do you think it is important? What does it entails?</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>1. Line 7, 10, 12, 22, 32, 93, 94, 95, 98</p> <p>2. Line 99: you have almost 12 twelve treatments, but I cannot understand which one is control; as the basis for comparison.</p> <p>3. Line 106, what is the full meaning of RCBD?</p> <p>4. Line 110</p> <p>5. Line 111 Added, to use this caption or any more appropriate one.</p> <p>6. Line 112: Specify, 0-10, 0-15, 0-20 or what depths?</p> <p>7. Line 113: What is the rationale behind sampling at these two stages?</p> <p>8. Line 115, 123</p> <p>9. Line 139: Added, to use this caption or any more appropriate one.</p> <p>10. Line 157: Why did you determined this parameter, is there any salinity problem in the study area?</p> <p>11. Line 237: Update your references appropriately after all the modifications.</p>	
Optional/General comments	<p>1. Line 225: Ideally this should be presented before the nutrients uptake</p>	

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Nafiu Garba Hayatu
Department, University & Country	Usmanu Danfodiyo University, Nigeria