

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_106098
Title of the Manuscript:	Effects of phosphogypsum and organic amendments on rice growth in a saline environment
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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>1. The peer-reviewed article "Effects of phosphogypsum and organic amendments on rice growth in a saline environment" is interesting and relevant. I have no problem with reviewing this article because I believe the authors have done a good literature search resulting in an excellent study that is powerful enough to add to the existing body of knowledge on the subject. More importantly, it will undoubtedly guide further research in this field on the effectiveness of using phosphogypsum and improving rice yield in saline environments.</p> <p>3. The abstract of the article is comprehensive.</p> <p>4. The structure of the manuscript is appropriate and contains the necessary sections.</p> <p>5. The manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>6. The list of used literary sources is sufficient and contains new references.</p> <p>7. It is necessary to indicate the name of the soil on which the research was carried out and to indicate its physico-chemical and agrochemical characteristics.</p> <p>8. It is necessary to indicate the methods and regulatory documents by means of which the studied indicators are determined.</p> <p>9. The analysis of the obtained research results needs expansion and addition.</p> <p>10. It is necessary to correct the conclusion, because it is too general. In the conclusion, it is necessary to expand the overview of the obtained research results.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language of the article is suitable for scientific communications.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The article presents the results of one-year studies, obtained from April to June 2021. How appropriate is it to highlight the results of one-year studies, or is it better to conduct studies for another 1-2 years, and then draw conclusions based on the average data obtained. The editors of the journal must decide whether it is correct and permissible to publish the results of one-year studies. In our country, articles are published with the results of two or three years of research, based on which certain conclusions and recommendations can already be made.</p> <p>In my opinion, the article deserves to be published after revision.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Olifir Yurii
Department, University & Country	Institute of Agriculture of Carpathian Region, National Academy of Agrarian Sciences, Ukraine