

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_86363
Title of the Manuscript:	CA- Based Planting Techniques and Weed Management Practices Influence on Nutrient Content and Their Uptake in Dry Direct-Seeded Rice (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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Writing needs improvement. Many errors, typos, wrong wording. Please proof read carefully or ask a native speaker for corrections of the text.• There is strict separation of planting and weeding techniques, why? Why was there no combination to identify the best combination by two-way ANOVA?	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Reasoning for the study in the introduction can be improved, but mostly that is a wording/English issue in my opinion.• At 2.1 "temperature ... during experimentation remained normal"- what does that mean in numbers?. Also, can you give a reference for the soil characteristics? E.g. available N,P,K also depend on crop rotation and management therefore "medium" is undefined. I see this is in table 1, please add that reference to 2.1 text• 2.2: what is the "kharif season" in terms of Gregorian calendar?• 2.4: why do you add ZnSO4?• 2.5 "as per standard method" is an undefined description- does that mean as in the reference paper? Or as the standard method of the lab, which is not known to a reader?• Results & discussion could also do with more explanation and comparison to other studies	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	From results and discussion onwards, the line spacing is smaller than before. In the tables there are also different font sizes, please correct.	

Review Form 1.6

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<u><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></u>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Josefine Kant
Department, University & Country	Institute for Plant & Geo-Sciences, Germany