

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_95764
Title of the Manuscript:	Study of integrated crop-targeted Production Efficient Fertilizer Uptaken Response.
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 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)	1. The research has its scientific importance because it points out the importance of fertilization fertility NPK. 2. The title corresponds to the search. 3. Abstract: I recommend organizing it better with introduction, objective, results and conclusion, in equal proportions for each topic. Keywords: remove the word "fertilizer uptake", as it is already in the title. 4. The article is well organized, but follow some guidelines: the paragraphs are very long; they must be divided, so that each paragraph has a maximum of 10 lines. 5. The article is scientifically correct. 6. 75% of references are from the last 10 years, this is well updated.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, the language/English is adequate	
Optional/General comments	Check the formatting of the article and the rules imposed by the journal.	

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:	Fabricio Simone Zera
Department, University & Country	Instituto Federal do Tocantins, Brazil