

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_90232
Title of the Manuscript:	Impact of field water tube based irrigation and split application of nutrients on yield and water productivity (Oryza sativa L.)
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In the abstract it's better to use full sentences to clarify the abbreviation meanings - In the introduction, the author need to add more references to give more strength to the introduction and highlight more the problematic. - Introduction, paragraph 2: can the author cite the different techniques? - Introduction, Paragraph 3: Add reference to the source of information - Introduction, paragraph 4: Add the full sentence to abbreviation (SRI) to allow the readers to understand. - Introduction, paragraph 4: In this part the author needs to highlight the key objectives and link it to the information cited in the text above. - Materials and Methods: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Paragraph 1: "The soil of the experimental site.... The end of the paragraph" : It's better to put these information in a table for more clarity. • Paragraph 2: To ensure a better understanding it's better to put information about the different applied treatments in a table • Paragraph 3: "recommended dose of fertilizer (150 kg N ha⁻¹, 50 kg P₂O₅ ha⁻¹ and 50 kg K₂O ha⁻¹)": this information based to what exactly? • Field Water Tube: Is it possible to add a figure that illustrates how the tube is placed in the field? - Results and discussion: The results are not fairly illustrated. The author needs to use statistical tools to compare and validate the results. As well as the results must be in the format of figures (histograms, etc). Also, there is a lot of text which makes difficult to understand and read the results. - Conclusion: Conclusion is too shallow; the author needs to develop more based to the results and there is a need to open the horizon for a complementary study if needed. 	All the necessary corrections were done as indicated
Minor REVISION comments		
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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	