

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Plant &amp; Soil Science</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJPSS_101967</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Response of nutrient management on growth indices and grain yield of different crop establishment methods in rice (Oryza sativa L.)</b>
Type of the Article	<b>research</b>

### **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> )

## Review Form 1.7

### 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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>relative contribution almost</p> <p>no, an important paragraph needs to be changed</p> <p>yes</p> <p>ok</p> <p>not!</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- only one paper more recent than 5 years;</li> <li>- only one other paperwork between 5-10 years old;</li> <li>- another paperwork between 10-15 years old;</li> <li>-4 works between 15-20 years old, i.e. published between 2003-2008;</li> <li>- two works between 20-25 years old (1999 and 2000);</li> <li>-another work published in 1984 (39 years ago), but not mentioned in the main text!</li> </ul> <p>I think that, in addition to the cited paperworks, the bibliography should be updated, because a lot has certainly been published on these topics! Two more problems with "References", one work that is not referred to in the text and another with the year of publication written differently than what is written in the text!</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	ok	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>I think that the paperwork should be improved in the "bibliography", with the addition of newer titles (the existing ones can be maintained). Mandatory, a paragraph from the "abstract" must be redone, it is important to show things concisely from the start!</p>	

### 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><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Magdalin Leonard Dorobat
Department, University & Country	University of Pitesti, Romania