

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Journal of Environment and Climate Change</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_85184
Title of the Manuscript:	NUTRIENT STATUS OF SOILS FROM THE KALESHWARAM PROJECT COMMAND AREA OF ERSTWHILE NIZAMABAD DISTRICT IN TELANGANA STATE
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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>Some modifications is to be needed in the followings:</p> <p><b>1. Abstract:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Rating of available N and P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub> are to be expressed by following standard rating chart, Wrong rating mentioned here.</li><li>- Keywords: It should be specific and not repeated, Name of place may be avoided.</li></ul> <p><b>2. Study area:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- In line number 7 and 8 of the paragraph, repetition of word granite should be avoided.</li></ul> <p>Fig. 3: There is missing of delineation of acidic soil area in the map.</p> <p><b>3. Soil Available Macronutrients:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- rating of available N and P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub> are to expressed by following standard rating chart. Correct it in the map also. Spell check of the name of Place.</li><li>- Use rating chart of either "P" or "P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>". Prepare its rating and then put it in the map.</li><li>- similar problem in rating of K also in the map.</li></ul> <p><b>4. For Micronutrient map:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- per cent distribution of samples of micronutrients in the map are not understandable.</li></ul> <p><b>5. Discussion:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Need Sodium, Calcium content data in soil</li><li>- Here low organic matter content data is missing in the table.</li><li>- Phosphorus data in the form of P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub> may be reviewed. It may be presented in the form of P only</li></ul> <p><b>6. Table 2:</b> level of significance is to be mentioned.</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	Spelling check	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

### 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>Yes. One big confined area is being evaluated here.</p>	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sankar Chandra Paul
Department, University & Country	Bihar Agricultural University, India