

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. | |
| <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. | |
| <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? | (If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details) | |

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Name: | Vaibhav Deoli |
| Department, University & Country | G.B. Pant National Institute of Himalayan Environment & Sustainable Development, India |