

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_84524
Title of the Manuscript:	Feasibility and product maturity of compost from poultry waste under temperate agr-oclimatic conditions of Kashmir Valley.
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	Authors studied “Feasibility ... Kashmir Valley” title itself spell mistake and period used! English should be corrected by native speaker who have knowledge in the subject., In Abstract: Feathers included with carcass? And define the microbial name (bacteria) general instead of scientific name in M+M? Introduction: Different fonts and several sentences grammar, syntax and format error. The objectives of the study needed more explanation. M+M: Check my corrections in MS Results: Check my corrections in MS Authors should delete redundant data in both Table and Figure format use only one Delete Table 1 it is already detailed in M+M Delete all figures except Plate 1 Overall, authors studied changes in N,P,K content in two climates in temperate climatic conditions with 4 different compositions of bird carcass and find small interesting results and compared to some similar studies still lacking description? I couldn't list all my suggestions in review form did a corrections in some parts of submitted MS please check them for complete review. M+M not complete especially microbial part, statistics and comparison study they used open site carcass decomposition etc., If authors studied more chemical and microbial composition it would have a great research with present condition this MS has only local interest with minor observations. Recommend editors can take decision My recommendation is major revision and re-submission	
Minor REVISION comments	Delete Figures 1-3 which is same as tables	
Optional/General comments	Further my extensive comments provided in MS directly I advise editor consider the main MS along with this revision form	

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:	Senthil Kumar Kurunthachalam
Department, University & Country	Ehime University, Japan