

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_85343
Title of the Manuscript:	Soil nutrient status under barley intercropped with poplar (<i>Populus deltoides</i>) agroforestry systems in Northern India
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>)

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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. In introduction part, references are missing many times for written sentences? It must be added.2. Grammatical mistakes have been observed many times in paper.3. Add at least 5 Review of literatures in Introduction sections.4. In methodology, name of test is written only. Tests should be explained.5. Presentation of graph (Fig1 and Fig 2) is different. It must be same.6. In result and discussion line 1, why barley crop at all depths was more considerable in poplar-based agroforestry system than in sole crop? There is a particular pattern or this is just result of your study. Explain properly.7. Discussion part is completely lacking, most of the times author only write results.8. Conclusion of the study more focused toward results.9. A well-structured abstract format must be followed i.e. General introduction, motivation of study, area method result and short conclusion.	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Reference have been added and highlighted.2. Grammatical mistakes also removed.3. Added review of literature (6).4. Explained.5. Have corrected the Fig.1. & 2. However the fig. 2 belong to different parameter so need not to be same as Fig. 1.6. Corrected.7. I have used the combined discussion and added some new also.8. Conclusion is always based on results so.9. Incorporated your valuable suggestions.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Units are missing at several places.2. Short forms cannot be used directly.3. Lot of big paragraphs have been seen in Introduction and Result section. It must be small for reader interest.	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. units have been added and highlighted.2. Full form are added now.3. The results have been modified according to suitability.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Manuscript might be accepted after major revision	

Review Form 1.6

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>	No