

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_97183
Title of the Manuscript:	"Assessment of Soil Fertility through Response of Rice (Oryza sativa L.) to Nutrient Omission in Alfisols of Kondagaon District of Chhattisgarh in India"
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 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. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	1 -The manuscript has middle importance for scientific community, The analysis indubitable have great importance for local agriculture. However, little importance for scientific community at all. 2 - The title is correct and with concordance with manuscript. 3 – Yes. Very clear presentation. 4 -Yes. 5.- The manuscript is in accord to a quantitative analysis. 6 – No. the references are out the date. It must be corrected. The authors must look for references with 5 years of publication or less. At least a part of set. The manuscript has a good statistic. With a nice delineation. However the Relevance to general science above is poof worked.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes.	
Optional/General comments	No comments more.	

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)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Marcio dos Santos Teixeira Pinto
Department, University & Country	Universidade Federal do Tocantins, Brasil