

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_90247
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of rhizobium inoculation with different levels of inorganic fertilizers on yield, nutrient content & uptake of chickpea (<i>Cicer arietinum</i> L.)
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	In the introduction section, the authors only stated the food value of Chickpea and the contributions of different nutrients and Rhizobium in improving quality and increasing yield. These are very well-known and proven statements. There is nothing about the problem and importance of this study. So, it is essential to rewrite the introduction section. The discussion is very poor. They should explain the reasons and justify their results.	
Minor REVISION comments	The abstract should address the following issues. What is the importance of the research? What problem does this work attempt to solve? It is not good to mention that treatment increased yield or nutrient uptake. How much yield improvement and nutrient uptake were achieved by RDF 125% + Rhizobium treatment? There are lots of grammatical errors, so the authors must avoid errors.	
Optional/General comments	The manuscript is a nice piece of work done by the authors, and the overall concept is interesting and important. The paper requires major revisions to be acceptable for publication. I have a few suggestions which I believe will improve the manuscript.	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mohammad Nazrul Islam
Department, University & Country	Bangladesh Rice Research Institute, Bangladesh