

## Review Form 1.7

|                          |   |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name:            | <b>International Journal of Plant &amp; Soil Science</b>  |
| Manuscript Number:       | <b>Ms_IJPSS_98183</b>   |
| Title of the Manuscript: | <b>Comparison Study of Uptake N-P-K fertilizers quantity to enhance Rice Crop production to meet yield data of rice crop by applying mathematical models.</b> |
| 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) |
|---|--|---|
| <b>Compulsory REVISION</b> comments<br>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b><br>(Please write few sentences on this manuscript)<br>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b><br>(If not please suggest an alternative title)<br>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b><br>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b><br>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b><br>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b><br><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b> | 1. <b>Yes, the manuscript is important for the scientific community given the aspects it addresses and the methods used.</b><br>2. <b>Yes, the title of the article is appropriate. But needs to be rephrased, in order to highlight the author's field/specialty, as follows Comparative study of mathematical model applications on the amount of N-P-K fertilizer absorbed to meet the best yield data of rice cultivation.</b><br>3. <b>Yes, the abstract of the article is comprehensive, but too long and not well articulated. Drafting plan proposal: Context (optional), Objectives, Methodology, Results, Conclusion.</b><br>4. <b>No, the subsections and structure of the manuscript are not appropriate. That the authors refer to the note to the authors or to the articles already published in the journal.</b><br>5. <b>Yes, the manuscript is scientifically correct. However, authors need to do better.</b><br>6. <b>The references are recent but not sufficient, since none of the results of this manuscript have been discussed (Discussion to be done).</b><br><b>7. Review the writing of the introduction by showing the different articulations (See remarks on the manuscript)</b> |   |
| <b>Minor REVISION</b> comments<br>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>   | 1. Yes   |   |
| <b>Optional/General</b> comments  | Strictly refer to the note to the authors of the review.   |   |

### **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:                            | <b>Moreto Salla</b>                                   |
| Department, University & Country | <b>Jean Lorougnon Guédé University, Côte d'Ivoire</b> |