

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. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Yes the manuscript important for scientific community and it is good idea for research</p> <p>Not suitable and must match the content</p> <p>Not comprehensive and must rewrite it again</p> <p>no</p> <p>no</p> <p>no</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	yes	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The paper aim very important and very good but the way for writes needs to be better.</p> <p>The abstract :</p> <p>Need to illustrate the idea of that paper also write the treatment in good way</p> <p>Material and methods</p> <p>The is no method Witten with references and you write about the Macronutrient Uptake (kg ha⁻¹) but in the result the author did not tell anything about that point</p> <p>The introduction</p> <p>The author must write the aim of work by the end of the introduction also the old and few reference he used</p> <p>The result just speak about the micronutrient with old reference</p> <p>References:</p> <p>Not found</p> <p>Dahdouh et al. (1999)</p> <p>Yoshida, 1981</p> <p>Found but not used</p> <p>Sriram Chandrasekharan, M.V. 2001. Effect of organic manures on the nutrient uptake, yield and nutrient use efficiency in lowland rice. Journal of Ecobiology. 13(2): 143-147.</p>	

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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Rasha Ramzy Mohamed Afify
Department, University & Country	National Research Centre, Egypt