SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**International Journal of Plant & Soil Science**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_IJPSS_20783**
Title of the Manuscript:	**SAWAH RICE FARMING ECO-TECHNOLOGY OPTIONS FOR EHANCING SUSTAINABLE NUTRIENT MANAGEMENT AND RICE PRODUCTION IN DEGRADED 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

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	This paper describes a study of water management and organic amendments in rice production. The study appears to be carried out in a sound way, although information is lacking. The introduction needs to be more concise, and focus only on what is relevant for the study, but give more background on that. Field methods need to be clearer and have more details. I think pictures can help for clarity in some cases, but there are too many pictures that don't tell you much. Furthermore, some motivation for how the quantities of organic amendments were chosen should be added (i.e. based on total or available N content). Please give more information about the statistical analysis. Is "Least Significant Difference" a test? Shouldn't some kind of anova rather be used here? I also don't understand the result tables, please show results in a more standard way. Furthermore, use correct words when referring to statistics and results in general. For example, say "significantly different/higher/lower from/than", not "significantly improved/highest". Always be careful with the use of value loaded words. Again, pictures do not tell much. The discussion is generally weak and just lists what other authors have found without always making the connection to the present study clear. Try instead to explain why you get the results you do, and if needed use other authors' results to help explain them. Remember	

	that you can't really say that something is "improved" or "good" without first an argument about what is the desired state. If the authors send me a word version of the manuscript, I can make changes and comments in the text.	
Minor REVISION comments	Get English language revision	
Optional/General comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Anonymous**
Department, University & Country	**Norway**