

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_97476
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of addition of carbon through residues in Rice-Rice cropping system under long term fertilizer experiment on soil carbon stock and biological properties in an Inceptisol of Bhubaneswar, Odisha
Type of the Article	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>)

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>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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>The manuscript is important for scientific community.</p> <p>The title of the article is not truly representing the contents presented in the research paper. As such there is no addition of carbon through residue as treatment. The title is superfluous and not based on the treatments tried.</p> <p>The abstract is not appropriate and it is loose mixing of different sections with no continuity and connectivity. The abstract should have been one unit comprising of the information related to what experiment was carried out, when was carried out, where was carried out, what was the purpose, what were treatments, experimental design, salient findings and inference. At present it looks like extractions from different sections from the thesis or report.</p> <p>Yes. The subsections and structures are alright.</p> <p>Manuscript is scientifically correct. But the presentation is vague and not very focussed. The references are sufficient in number. However their presentation is not uniform. They should have been uniformly presented as per the style of the journal.</p> <p>Specific comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Since there are no treatments of addition of carbon in the form of residue, how rational it is to use the title like "Effect of addition of carbon through residues.....". It is erroneous and misleading. 2. The abstract should have more compact with no sections as one cohesive unit. 3. The introduction is too lengthy and lack continuity and style of scientific presentation. Some of the statements are not related to the aspects of the study and more superfluous. Instead of details of studies of previous workers, their findings should have been highlighted appropriately. It looks like taken as such from review of literature. 4. The information presented in Chart 1 (How appropriate to call like that?) could have been presented describing the quality aspects of FYM after that treatment. 5. It would have been appropriate had the authors used the title like the effect of nutrient management in rice – rice cropping systems on the stubble added in the soil and its contribution to the soil organic carbon stock, physico-chemical and microbial biomass carbon. 6. Further, these factors should have been correlated crop yield. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The quality of presentation is not up to mark. It could have been more refined and as per the norms followed in the scientific communication. There is a large scope for improvement. The authors are advised to refer some good papers on this topic and prepare this paper on those lines.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The paper needs thorough revision and refinement focussing more on presentation based on their actual work and findings.</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>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	B.G. Shivakumar
Department, University & Country	ICAR-Indian Grassland and Fodder Research Institute, India