

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_129319
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of different nitrogen levels on growth, yield, and nitrogen use efficiency (NUE) of Hardinath Hybrid Dhan-1 in Madhesh Province, Nepal
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer’s comment	Author’s Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript is significant for the scientific community as it provides valuable insights into the optimal nitrogen management for hybrid rice cultivation, specifically Hardinath Hybrid Dhan-1, in Madhesh Province, Nepal. By identifying the ideal nitrogen levels to maximize growth, yield, and nutrient use efficiency, the study contributes to sustainable agricultural practices and food security. Additionally, the findings on soil health and nutrient availability offer important implications for long-term soil fertility management. This research can serve as a reference for future studies and help inform policy decisions related to rice production and fertilizer use.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	It is specific and informative, making it easy for readers to understand the scope of the research. However you may improve by mentioning it is study on rice species	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract of the article is quite comprehensive, covering the key aspects of the study, including the objective, methodology, results, and conclusion. However, there are a few suggestions to enhance its clarity and completeness: Methodology: The methodology is well-described. However, you might want to briefly mention the statistical analysis used. Results: The results section is comprehensive, but you could add a brief mention of the statistical significance of the findings. Conclusion: The conclusion is clear, but you might want to emphasize the practical implications of the findings for farmers and agricultural practices. AND ALSO 1. What is the research gap? 2. Hardinath Hybrid Dhan-1 is rice species? Should mention in prior to make the context of the article clear	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Based on the provided sections of the manuscript, it appears to be scientifically correct. The study follows a well-defined experimental design, including appropriate controls and replications. The methodology is detailed and robust, ensuring the reliability of the results. The statistical analysis is mentioned, which adds to the credibility of the findings. The results are clearly presented and supported by relevant literature, which justifies the observed trends and outcomes. The conclusions drawn from the study are logical and based on the data provided. Additionally, the manuscript addresses important aspects of nitrogen management in rice cultivation, contributing valuable insights to the scientific community. However, for a comprehensive assessment, it would be beneficial to review the full manuscript, including all sections such as the introduction, literature review, detailed methodology, complete results, discussion, and references. This would ensure that all scientific standards and guidelines are met throughout the document.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	I would suggest to add other additional paper which show how they discuss further how N content may affect growth of the plant,so suggested to add this reference: 1. DOI: 10.47836/pjtas.46.1.17 2. DOI: 10.47836/pjtas.44.1.13	

Review Form 3

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	yes	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with the 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 detail)</i> no	
Are there competing interest issues in this manuscript?	no	
If plagiarism is suspected, <u>please provide related proofs or web links.</u>	10.3126/ajnv7i1.62165 Do check with this one,so you might adjust a bit on the arrangement	

PART 3: Declaration of Competing Interest of the Reviewer:

Here reviewer should declare his/her competing interest. If nothing to declare he/she can write “I declare that I have no competing interest as a reviewer”

PART 4: Objective Evaluation:

Guideline	MARKS of this manuscript
Give OVERALL MARKS you want to give to this manuscript (Highest: 10 Lowest: 0) <u>Guideline:</u> Accept As It Is: (>9-10) Minor Revision: (>8-9) Major Revision: (>7-8) Serious Major revision: (>5-7)	8

Review Form 3

Rejected (with repairable deficiencies and may be reconsidered): (>3-5) Strongly rejected (with irreparable deficiencies.): (>0-3)	
---	--

Review Form 3

Editorial Comments (This section is reserved for the comments from journal editorial office and editors):

	Author’s Feedback
Practical Implications: SINCE DATA Given here is 2020 study, I not sure any published data on this. And this article look quite similar with : 10.3126/ajin.v7i1.62165 Performance of Promising Rice Genotypes as Affected by Different Nitrogen Levels in Central Terai of Nepal So may change a bit the structure of scopes of finding	

Reviewer Details:

This section is mandatory to prepare the Reviewer Certificate.
Please complete this section carefully. Reviewer Certificate will be generated by using this information only.
Your Certificate will be wrong, if you provide incorrect information.
Please note modification of certificate will not be possible after generation.
Certificate will not be issued if incomplete information is provided.

Name of the Reviewer	
Department of Reviewer	
University or Institution of Reviewer	
Country of Reviewer	
Position: (Professor/lecturer, etc.) of Reviewer	
Email ID of Reviewer	
WhatsApp Number of Reviewer (Optional)	
Write 5-8 Keywords regarding expertise of Reviewer	