



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_47994
Title of the Manuscript:	Integrated Nutrient Management of rice soil in hilly region of Meghalaya, India
Type of the Article	<u>Original Research Article</u>

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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Where the research is conducted, its location(s) and year(s) of the conduct of the research needs to be known in abstract. 2. Statistical method used in analysing the data also needs to be stated. 3. INM is not a key word. 4. Tables should be in three lines as corrected in Table 1. 5. "Irrespective" appears too many in the text, alternative word(s) should be used to replace it in some places, such as regardless and heedless. 6. Tenses needs to be checked. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Location and years of the research along with some other details has been incorporated in the abstract. 2. Information regarding statistical analysis is added in the materials and methods section. 3. Table format has been changed (by altering the visibility of some borders). 4. The word Irrespective (along with other repetitive words) has been replaced with alternative words in some portions of the text. 5. Tenses are corrected as per the suggestion of the reviewer.
<u>N Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> 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?	<i>(If yes. Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	There is no ethical issue in connection with the experiment.