



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_20792
Title of the Manuscript:	ASSESSMENT OF DIFFERENT LAND PREPARATION FOR SAWAH FARMING TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT IN NUTRIENT MANAGEMENT AND RICE GRAIN YIELD IMPROVEMENT IN INLAND VALLEYS OF SOUTHEASTERN NIGERIA
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>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>Language and expressions need general improvement.</p> <p>1. Abstract:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Too long (more than 300 words) and mostly repetition of materials and methods. Should be shortened. - Lines 20-31: just indicate design used with major and sub-treatments - Lines 31-37: Irrelevant information to content of manuscript - Lines 38-47; Relevant information but should be summarised. - Lines 48: Irrelevant information <p>2. Materials and Methods:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Line 142. How was sampling for yield done? Grain yield should be expressed at a standard moisture level and not dry matter. -Line 143; How was the soil sampling done throughout the experiment? -Line 150: Indicate reference and procedure for pH analysis. <p>3. Results and Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Lines 169-170: Were increases in soil pH due to improved soil/water management under sawah or geological fertilization as it contradicts statements on Lines 172-174 -Line 191: Interaction of tillage systems and amendments were not significant during 2rd and 3rd years. Any possible explanation? -Line 223. Any reasons for the NS interaction between environment and amendments for the 3years? - Units of Tables 6,7,8,9 should be provided. However, all these tables could be combined into one table/figure which can provided a better presentation/understanding of results <p>4. Conclusion</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	-Lines 354-362: A repetition of results and discussion. Should provide a major observation/findings and a possible recommendation for the use of rice farmers and others.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Line 82, 83, 85, and others: sawah tillage systems should be converted to sawah system -Line 85: The study aim” should be corrected to “This study aims to.....” -Line 146; Laboratory Analysis and not methods -Lines 175-178; Not necessary as statements/observation as stated were not verified under this study. -Line 195, 238 and others: It was obtained should read it was observed - Line 196-196: statement not clear - Line 230: Statistically to be replaced with significantly -Lines 190, 222, 244, 272, 277, 282, 286. Check titles and fix missing word “ on” - Line 308: 3yr study is not enough to provide a long term improvement observation. -Lines 296, 297, 310, 311: replace cmol kg^{-1} with cmol (+) kg^{-1} - Line 322, 323, 326, 337, 338: replace t/ha with t ha^{-1} 	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Title could be modified to reflect content of manuscript. E.g. Effect of different land preparation methods under the sawah system on soil productivity improvement and rice grain yield.....	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	M. Moro Buri
Department, University & Country	CSIR-Soil Research Institute, Kumasi, Ghana