

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_84429
Title of the Manuscript:	Impact Fly ash on nutrient status of wetland rice cultivation
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>)

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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<p>Title. The evaluation was carried out on soil chemical and physical alterations not on rice cultivation. As a matter of fact, rice production and yield should be measured as they are the recipients of soil amendments.</p> <p>Abstract. The content of the abstract does not fit the title. It must describe the content of the experiment.</p> <p>Materials and Methods Single season experiment. Not enough given the weather variability from season to season that affects nutrients availability and crop intake.</p> <p>Crop production and yield were not measured. They are the final judge of a successful amendment.</p> <p>Conclusions. They are partially speculative. The references to yields and economics are not supported as they were not measured.</p>	The data regarding the yield of rice crop has been added and justified.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Not common English usage. There are many syntax and construction errors (too fastidious to enumerate here) that can be easily corrected after careful reading by native English speaker. I pointed out a few of them in the original manuscript itself.	The mistakes pointed out in the manuscript are corrected.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The work was well carried out but it lacks depth and scope. The extension for two more seasons and the statistical analysis of the extended data would give the necessary depth to this initiated work.	Sure. I will consider the recommendation for the future studies. Thank you

Review Form 1.6

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>	