

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_85424
Title of the Manuscript:	Household Waste Based Vermicompost and Fertilizer Effect on Yield and Attributes of Pot Culture Rice
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>The entire article is written in long phrases, being hard to understand their meaning. See the Abstract, for example – the second part, 10 rows, are made of 2 sentences.</p> <p>Explain what is RDF, it isn't mentioned in the text. What about "kharif"? It only appears in Abstract.</p> <p>Tables and Fig. are strange mentioned in the article body, not being integrated, but announced (for example: "The table-4 the influence of vermicompost and fertilizer on the straw yield").</p> <p>Check the References mention in the text. Anandhan et al. (2016) it has the wrong year. Kansotia et al. (2013) it isn't mentioned, but there is Meena et al. (2013) – probably the same thing. Also, the "Reference" section is presented in a disorderly manner, with a lot of additional spaces, blanks etc. Please correct this.</p>	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<p>"Conclusion" could be better – this is the part that most readers are interested in.</p>	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Horoias Roxana
Department, University & Country	University of Agronomic Sciences and Veterinary Medicine, Romania