

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_127256
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect Of Kaolin On Rice Production Under Iron Toxicity Conditions: Determination Of The Effective Dose Of Kaolin Against Iron Toxicity In Irrigated Or Lowland Rice Cultivation
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	I greatly commend the researcher for this article . Iron toxicity reduces soil productivity and inhibits plant growth. This study will help in soil amendment using cheap/available materials like SiO ₂ which the local farmers can afford in the face of high cost of organic fertilizers.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	I think the title is suitable	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract is good	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes,they are.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	I commend the researcher again. I think soil parameters should have been analyzed. In subsection 2.2 of the Experiment pot of growing substrate; the researcher didn't state the diameter of the sieve used to eliminate other elements. I believe he/she should state the sieve diameter as a guide.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The researcher has few recent references. His/her references should be majorly those from 2014 till date.	
Minor REVISION comments	Yes,it is.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	I commend the researcher on this work and hope local farmers gain the knowledge and practice it.	

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:	Mgbeahuru, Chibuihem Izuchukwu
Department, University & Country	Nigeria