



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>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

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 manuscript is accepted with minor changes. It has scientific quality, good support statistical and the parameters evaluated were adequate. Few errors were founded during the revision. In all manuscript write Dhan no dhan</p> <p>Title: is ok</p> <p>Abstract:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Add experimental design and replicates. 2. Little corrections were done in the manuscript. <p>Introduction:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Add the economic importance (yield, annual production and production value) of rice production in Bangladesh. 2. To write the objective of this experiment. 3. Little corrections were done in the manuscript. <p>Materials and Methods:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To write the main agronomic characteristics of three rice varieties used in this experiment (BRRI Dhan 56, 57 and 62). 2. To add Statistical analysis: (computer package program and means separation test and probability level. 3. Some corrections were done in the manuscript. <p>Results and discussion:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is ok, Figures and Table are clear. 2. Little corrections were done in Table 1. <p>Conclusion: Is ok</p> <p>Reference:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is ok. Only the reference Sachdev et al., 1991 cited in results and discussion (grain yield) section is missing in the reference list. 2. Little corrections were done in the manuscript. 	
Minor REVISION comments		
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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Raúl Leonel Grijalva-Contreras
Department, University & Country	Instituto Nacional de Investigaciones Forestales Agrícolas y Pecuarias, México