



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advances in Agricultural Research
Manuscript Number:	MS_AJAAR_47567
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of zinc fertilizer application on growth yield and yield contributing characters in rice
Type of the 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	The paper is important because it aims to provide information about nutrition with Zn in rice cultivation In the paper there are no clear work objectives In materials and methods the methodology for the analysis of the results is not indicated In the results (Fig 1) it is not known if there are significant differences by the application of Zn in the leaf area index, as it is intended to show. The same for all other variables evaluated. The effect of interaction between rice varieties and application of Zn is not evaluated either, which would very likely occur due to the antecedents that appear in the introduction of the variability of the tenors of this nutrient in the grain according to the genotype. the conclusions are poor and have no scientific basis.	
Minor REVISION comments	The research is conducted, provides a great amount of information and this great experimental effort is not reflected in the paper. The lack of statistical analysis of the results, minimally ANVA, to establish differences between treatments and possible interactions Genotype X fertilization, makes the interpretation of the data is merely subjective and careasca of scientific basis, in addition to not allow conclusions to be drawn of weight. The paper would be of high quality and would provide great information if the results are analyzed and interpreted correctly.	
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)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Martín María Silva Rossi
Department, University & Country	Argentina