Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Asian Research Journal of Agriculture**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_ARJA_83329**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Influence of Manganese on Nutrient Uptake in Rice Plants under Saline Conditions**
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.journalarja.com/index.php/ARJA/editorial-policy)

Review Form 1.6

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	It is an interesting topic, it is clearly presented in the abstract, the introduction and the methodology, with some details especially regarding the bibliographic citations. However, there is a structure regarding the results and discussion that must be reviewed and worked on that allow the work carried out to have a level to be published.	
Minor REVISION comments	When results and discussion are presented, work is done on it, the results are presented and discussed, it is not possible to discuss what happens in a controlled experiment and the field conditions, which were not part of the work. (paragraph 1) In this same section, the methodology and the hypotheses to be contrasted are not proposed (paragraph 2) When proposing results, these must be accompanied by figures or some figure that supports them (paragraph 3) The presentation and its results have to generate confusion due to the way in which the discussion is presented, where it is stated how the elements behave in the soil towards the plant, even when working under controlled conditions, it is interesting, however, it should be better review this section The tables show an interesting statistical analysis, however, the methodology does not explain the argument of the realization of averages using different treatments, a procedure that tends to be an error in the statistical analysis. Bibliography should be placed in alphabetical order, in order not to repeat citations as in this case, There are citations that are key and correspond to the bases, so you present quite late publication dates, however, to be a manuscript to be published in 2022, it presents more than 95% of the citations with more than 10 years of publication	
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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Alexis Valerio Valery Ramirez**
Department, University & Country	**University of Táchira, Venezuela**