

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_95551
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Different Nitrogen Sources on Growth and Yield of Rice (Oryza sativa)
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.journalijpss.com/index.php/IJPSS/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)
<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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. In many cases, the results of experiments with different nutrient supplements provide solutions to the challenges of today, so the manuscript contains important information for practical producers (farmers) as well.</p> <p>2. Yes</p> <p>3. The abstract adequately presents the content of the article and the investigated factors. It matches the article title and keywords well.</p> <p>4. The structure and division of the article is appropriate, clear and easy to understand for anyone.</p> <p>5. The manuscript is scientific and corresponds to the expansion of the results applied in the research field, the reference bases of other articles.</p> <p>6. The references are sufficiently fresh and well applied.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The author used professional English and scientific terms well.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The article adequately shows how the combinations applied to a given soil type can influence the investigated rice variety. This is outstanding because, in accordance with the modern era, intensive cultivation was/were kept in mind, which can greatly help to improve production in the examined area.</p> <p>The article contains minimal typing errors, it can be published after correction.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Tatárváriné Nagy Nikoletta
Department, University & Country	University of Debrecen, Hungary