

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_104856
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of different tillage and nutrient management practices on yield attributes and economics of direct seeded rice
Type of the Article	Effects of different tillage and nutrient management practices on yield attributes and economics of direct seeded rice

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. <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	1. Yes, it is important to boost rice productions in countries with sufficient rainfall for water use consumption. 2. It is suitable 3. Yes it is comprehensive but it has many unclear sentences. 4. Yes 5. No because the results and discussions are only about the factors (tillage and fertilizers) not about the combinations or the treatments. For example T1N1..... (the experiment had 9 treatments). another thing there is no any mention of replication. If the treatments were not replicated more than three times, the study is meaningless. The same is true with time (should be atleast two years results). Third point water use efficiency or crop water productivity is not included. 6. Can be sufficient	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	I treid to mark the problems inside the manuscript. The author can look at the corrections and can correct accordingly.	
Optional/General comments		

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?	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ghebretnsae Tesfalem Weldeslassie
Department, University & Country	Hamelmallo Agricultural College, Eritrea