

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_102147
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Varieties and sulphur on growth and yield validation of rice (Oryza sativa L.)
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. The manuscript is important for scientific community especially those who deal with agriculture. However, the discussion is too short. Maybe this is because the references are limited. Also the economic aspect is not explored enough, just the result (b/C ratio) which is confusing (Abstract 1,90 and Conclusion 2.92).</p> <p>2. Not really, since the context of the word 'varieties' it is not clear. The title would be better if changed to 'The effect of sulphur on growth and yield of Rice (Oryza sativa L.).</p> <p>3. The abstract is too short.</p> <p>4. Subsections and structure are appropriate.</p> <p>5. The manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>6. The references are not sufficient and not recent. Some more recent references (published in the last five years) will improve the quality of the manuscript.</p> <p>Additional comments</p> <p>1. Check Table 1. Put some missing units.</p> <p>2. Some authors are in paper but not in references list (ex: Ram et al, Rajesh et al). On the contrary, Some are in references list but not in paper (ex: Asha et al, Chandel et al). Fix them.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>1. The language needs some improvements.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</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:	Iman Santosa
Department, University & Country	Indonesia