

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_100044
Title of the Manuscript:	Influence of Varieties and Foliar spray of Zinc on Growth , Yield and Economics of Rice (Oryza sativa L.)
Type of the Article	Original 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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Is the manuscript important for scientific community? It is very important to the scientific world as well as farming communities considering the importance of micronutrients like zinc and poor soils</p> <p>Is the title of the article suitable? The title of the article is suitable</p> <p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? The abstract of the article is comprehensive but should consider to incorporate the method and materials inclusive</p> <p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate but would love each discussion to be followed by a Table and style of writing is repetitive which can quickly put off the readers.</p> <p>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? The manuscript is scientifically correct because of its nature and references cited and listed, but the views of the author are not properly articulated. The manuscript is solely dependent of views of other scientists. The tables must include the mean values.</p> <p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. The references are sufficient but the author needed to use those that are 10 years back except for the original ones (Those recorded by the founders). Check those missed in the list and those listed but not cited</p> <p>The author (s) must indicate how the data was analysed. Clearly specify the control treatment Include the mean values</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications but need to improve on grammar and word spacing is not consistent</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</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:	Felix Mereka Chipojola
Department, University & Country	Malawi