

Review Form 1.6

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name: | International Journal of Environment and Climate Change |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_IJECC_89494 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Effect of microbial consortium for nutrient dynamics and biological activity of paddy field under insitu decomposition |
| Type of the Article | Original Research 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, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here) |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|
| Compulsory REVISION comments | <p>1. It is necessary to specify the type of analysis and, where appropriate, the comparison test used: LSD-Fisher, Duncan, HSD Tukey, or other.</p> <p>"The experimental data were statistically analyzed with the critical differences worked out at 5% (0.05) probability"</p> <p>2. Detail the methodology used or cite a source where said methodology is described. Remember that the analysis methods are usually modified according to the characteristics of the soil or standards of each laboratory.</p> <p>Available Nitrogen : Alkaline Permanganate method Available Phosphorus: Olsen's extractant method Available potassium : Neutral normal ammonium acetate method Soil enzyme : Colorimetric method Micronutrients : DTPA Extractant method ----- described by author</p> <p>3. MISSING footer of TABLE 1. The effect of residue management on rice crop's plant height. This is essential to interpret the data. Interpreting the CD values $p=0.05$ for the growth stages of the crop, there would be no statistically significant differences; that is, in the context of the experiment, the treatments would not have had an effect on the growth of the crop in any of the stages evaluated. Add the result of the comparison test between treatments for better interpretation.</p> <p>The same applies to all other tables.</p> <p>4. Indicate the reference of the numerical results based on which these results are obtained (Table 1, Figure 1...). If it is indicated that there was a "significantly" increase, then we speak of statistical results. Specify.</p> <p>Available N in the soil increased significantly with the rice stubble incorporation using rotavator and applied with TNAU biomineralizer @ 2kg/ton of residue along with balancing C:N ratio with urea</p> | |
| Minor REVISION comments | <p>1. If possible, increase the discussion on this point, since it establishes a good foundation for future studies.</p> <p>"Effect of residue management on the soil micro-nutrients and soil enzyme activities"</p> | |
| Optional/General comments | <p>Interesting work, but if the methodologies are not specified and the results of the statistical analysis are clearly shown, its interpretation could be complicated.</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? | (If yes. Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details) | |

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|----------------------------------|----------------------------|
| Name: | Laydy Mitsu Mena Chacón |
| Department, University & Country | Universidad de Chile, Perú |