



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Soil Research Journal</a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_ASRJ_45777</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Role integrated mineral fertilizers and bio-fertilizers on some soil properties, behavior nutrients in rice plant and rice productivity under newly reclaimed saline soil conditions</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Review Paper</b>

**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**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Please refer to my extensive comments in the attached edited paper.</b>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<p>Someone with more proficiency in the language should edit it. The wrong use of words causes confusion in the message. The author obviously did not refer to the 'author's guidelines' of this journal. Please do so. The reference style is wrong and there are many other mistakes.</p> <p>What is a fed? I have no idea, but maybe I just don't know the unit. Maybe write it out or explain it when first used? Tables are incorrectly numbered (two no 2). I understand the author used mineral fertilizers with and without bio-fertilizers. I would think the treatments should have been as follows: No fertilizer; Rate 1 NPK; Rate 2 NPK; Rate 3 NPK; Rate 1+yeast; Rate 1 + bacteria, Rate 2 + yeast, Rate 2 + bacteria, Rate 3 + yeast, Rate 3 + bacteria, Yeast alone, Bacteria alone, Yeast + Bacteria, Rate 1 + yeast and bacteria, rate 2 + yeast and bacteria, rate 3 + yeast and bacteria. This is not what happened, obviously. I struggle to understand quite what you tested. I suggest a table with the combinations exactly put down. The author mentions significance several times, but never give a number (p=.08 for instance). Again check the guidelines for the correct format. The only text in bold should be the headings of tables and descriptions of figures. Again – check the guidelines and read through pervious published papers on the website of the journal. Mass and weight – it is two different things.</p> <p>I believe the work has merit – a lot. Unfortunately all the permutations were not tested and the reporting seems inadequate.</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

**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>	

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Anélia Marais</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>South Africa</b>