

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJA_101688
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECTS OF MINERAL NUTRITION ON IRON TOXICITY SEVERITY, LEAF CHOROPLYL LEVELS AND GRAINS SOLUBLES SUGAR OF FLOODY LOWLAND RATOON RICE (Oryza sp) Nerica L 14 UNDER RAINFED REGIME
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.journalarja.com/index.php/ARJA/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"> 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. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This manuscript is very important, because it discusses the decrease in the content of iron-containing toxins. In addition, the analysis that becomes a reference is the chlorophyll content and sugar content in rice. This manuscript is very interesting and relevant to be published 2. Suitable 3. Yes, 4. Yes, appropriate 5. Yes, The discussion given is supported by scientific studies derived from books or articles. The discussion given was quite good and in accordance with the discussion. Only, there are still some sentences that are not in accordance with grammar. Also, there are still a lot of wrong words 6. The references bibliography provided by a large chart is the most recent source. And the references given are quite a lot, complete and in accordance with the discussion in the article 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	The language used in the script is still not good in quality. There are still writing words that are wrong, not in accordance with grammar, and not in accordance with writing rules	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	The content of the article is quite complete and the discussion of data has been supported by relevant sources. Only, there is still a lot of writing that is not quite right. The results of turnitin testing are still quite high, please readjust the sentence in the article	

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Elok Kurnia Novita Sari
Department, University & Country	State Polytechnic of Jember, Indonesia