

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_102165
Title of the Manuscript:	Nutrient and water use efficiency, nutrient uptake and yield of Rice as influenced by fertigation levels and weeds management practices
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>)

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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> In my opinion, the manuscript deals with a very intriguing and inspiring subject which results contribute to the scientific community. In my view, the title of the article is suitable giving the appropriate information about the subject of the study. The abstract is concise. It would be better to add the meaning of abbreviations into a parenthesis to be more comprehensive. The abstract is the second part of a paper that attracts the readers' attention after the title, so it would be better to explain the meaning of abbreviations. The manuscript is structured appropriately and the sections are well organized. In my opinion, the manuscript is scientifically correct. The references are sufficient and recent. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	The study is well-written using the English language properly. I suggest revising the article and correcting a few grammatical and syntax errors.	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	The overall manuscript is well-written and well-structured with proper use of the English language. Your study's findings are intriguing and promising for future research.	

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:	Anthoula Gleridou
Department, University & Country	Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Greece