



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJA_47013
Title of the Manuscript:	Response of Upland Rice to Nitrogen and Phosphorus Fertilization on Vertisols of Tigray, Ethiopia
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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

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	<p>The paper is important because it provides information to increase the production of rice in Ethiopian vertisols and improve the nutritional management of the crop</p> <p>There is no clear objective of work. There is an error in the experimental design is not a factorial of two factors N and P, if not of four since the study was also carried out in three locations with edaphic differences. The differential effect of the soil is not taken into account and they have important differences which is why it is very possible that when including the soil factor, location, or level of phosphorus, organic matter or total nitrogen, you will surely see differences in the response according to the experimental site, in addition to the possible interaction effects N, P, site. The analysis of the results as planned will not make sense and may mask results, since when analyzing the results of the different sites together, it is assumed that there is no difference by type of soil and environment. For these reasons the conclusions are not valid.</p>	<p>Our objective is clear and tried to determine the nitrogen and phosphorus rates for the whole district. Also, there was no mistake or faulty during experimental planning and design. This experiment have four locations * two factors (N and P rates). During analysis we have considered the environmental factors since we conducted on four sites but we haven't mentioned in the manuscript because of insignificant differences of location*N or location*P. Thus, we opted to choose combined analysis as it is the better way for scaling up the recommendation and for extension system of the country.</p>
Minor REVISION comments	<p>The research is well planned, with great experimental effort, from which a great amount of data arise but they have serious errors in how they are analyzed, since the variation of the edaphic environment is important.</p>	
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)	