

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_69806
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of organic manures and chemical fertilizers on growth, yield and quality traits of summer squash (Cucurbita pepo L.)” cv. Punjab Chappan Kaddu
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:

<http://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The authors would like to push the mixing of organic and inorganic fertilizer as the recommended application in the conclusion, so that the results and discussion are focused on the mixing treatments. However, the authors neglected that the pure 100% chemical fertilizer (T2) improved plant growth, yield, and quality as well. The results and discussion under T2 and its relationships with other treatments are strongly required. 2. The meaning and sharp discussion of each finding of each parameter are missing. 3. A comprehensive discussion is required, since the authors discuss the findings independently as per parameter. 4. Statistical evidence of all data is missing, resulting in a doubt of the study. 5. The authors discuss the potential reason behind their findings using the phrases of 'soil nutrient supply', 'gibberellin and IAA', 'auxins, vitamin, and mineral', 'carbohydrate accumulation in fruit', 'availability of micronutrient like B, Cu, Mn, Zn etc' and 'nutrient absorption' based on other studies. However, the authors do not provide the data of those two. I strongly recommend to analyse both indicators to support the findings and discussion. 6. On referring other studies, it is unclearly described what findings of the other studies that are similar to the author findings; and how the findings of other studies are related to the author's findings. <p>(detail comments are attached in each part in the manuscript text)</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Consistency on using the treatment names is needed to be improved to provide a smooth reading. 2. It is strongly required to describe the methods of each parameter observed in this study in the 'material and method' section. 3. It is strongly required to describe the statistical analysis in the 'material and method' section and statistical analysis results in the table. 4. The whole results are not discussed well. 5. Abbreviation is unclearly described in the first introduction timings. <p>(detail comments are attached in each part in the manuscript text)</p>	

Comment [C1]: Where are the data?

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?	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p> <p>Statistical analysis results are not provided in this study, causing the validation lost of the study. This becomes a critical ethical issue in a scientific report.</p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Yufita Dwi Chinta
Department, University & Country	Hokkaido University, Japan