



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>List names of the author and co-authors if any and their institutions of work after the title and before the abstract of the manuscript.</p> <p>Please researcher; work on the manuscript grammar so that the meaning is appropriately understood.</p>	<p>Done as per your recommendation</p>
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Your introduction is meaningful and relates well with the abstract, results and the conclusion brings out a consistent logical end of the manuscript, only that the introduction is too long for a reader. Since it is a good opener, kindly make it brief but with sense as it is currently.</p> <p>Be brief on treatments, design and procedures of the experiment-It is wordy, so make it short and substantial.</p> <p>Make soil sampling and analysis short and precise also, and it will give us at a glance on the critical soil properties that do influence the uptake of both P and N fertilizer in the soils and the added levels.</p>	<p>We have tried to correct as much as possible in the methodology section very carefully.</p>
Optional/General comments	The manuscript is generally good for publication.	

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)	