

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_101722
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Phosphorus and Micronutrients on Yield and Economics of Rice (Oryza sativa L.)
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.journalijps.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. The topic is interesting, the submitted article being just a part from the wider research (I hope so).</p> <p>2. The title is simple, but correct. To be specific, I consider that it is helpful to mention even the micronutrients (P, Z, B).</p> <p>3. The Abstract should start with some considerations about the discussed subject. Please remove the phrase with the description of soil conditions – use it in Material and Methods, not here. Also, add here the aim of the paper, before results and conclusions.</p> <p>4. The structure and sections are correct.</p> <p>5. The findings aren't enough processed from statistical point of view, but they seem to be correct.</p> <p>6. I suggest to use at least 10 references. The used ones are correctly cited in the text.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>English language is acceptable, but the authors still need to pay attention to sentences/phrases – please check and correct the entire paper. The most visible example is in Conclusions.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>POOR CONCLUSIONS! Please correct the single phrase add to Conclusions and then complete this subsection.</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:	Horoias Roxana
Department, University & Country	University of Agronomic Sciences and Veterinary Medicine of Bucharest, Romania