

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_95002
Title of the Manuscript:	Long term effect of different nutrient management practices on micro nutrient uptake under rice-rice cropping system
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.journalijpss.com/index.php/IJPSS/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. The article is an Original Research work on Long term effect of different nutrient management practices on micro nutrient uptake under rice-rice cropping system. It contributes to an important aspect of soil science and agriculture. Overall, it is a good article and may be accepted after the suggested minor changes have been implemented.</p> <p>2. The title of the article is suitable.</p> <p>3. The abstract is comprehensive and gives an insight of the whole article.</p> <p>4. The sub-sections and structure of the article are appropriate apart from the Introduction which lacks a headline. More references including recent ones should be added in the Introduction section.</p> <p>5. The manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>6. The references are insufficient and not recent. The author(s) are required to add more relevant and recent references in the Introduction part of the article.</p> <p>Additional comments:</p> <p>i. The keywords are traditionally written in alphabetical order separated by semicolons. The author(s) may please take a note of it.</p> <p>ii. The authors should include some photographs of the actual sites, soil samples, etc. for better understanding of the research.</p> <p>iii. The Longitude and Latitude of the study areas should be mentioned.</p> <p>iv. There are minor grammar and formatting mistakes in the article. Some of these have been highlighted by the reviewer for the author(s) to take note of. The author(s) should correct them before re-submission.</p> <p>v. The author(s) should provide some information about the prevailing weather conditions, temperatures, rainfall data, humidity, etc. and their effects on the soil quality that would help the readers to gauge the research better.</p> <p>vi. The introduction section does not have a heading as "INTRODUCTION". The author(s) should add this.</p> <p>vii. The author(s) should add a "future scope of study" section after the conclusion section, describing in brief how this current research can help in future research.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Yes, the language/English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications.	
Optional/General 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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Avdesh Bhardawaj
Department, University & Country	India