



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>Journal of Applied Life Sciences International</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JALSI_22607
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of different methods of Zn application on rice growth, yield and nutrients dynamics in plant and soil
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	It's a routine work planned with an aim to evolve technology to combat the problem of Zn deficiency in rice production in the region. Therefore, the outcome of the study is more relevant to the local issues. The paper needs major revision in the light of following comments: 1. The write up of the paper needs major revision to improve readability in terms of English language. 2. In the introduction section, include only the work done that is most relevant to the objective of the study. 3. Avoid repetitions mainly in the results section. 4. Results need to be discussed. 5. Need to draw conclusions, particularly the comparative cost and economic benefit of various treatments. 6. Figures 1 & 2 can be clubbed. 7. Treatments can better be written in text form and delete table 2 8. Please recheck the numerical values of N, P, K and Zn contents of grain and straw. They seem too low compared to other reports for rice.	You are right, because the Zn deficiency is the common problem in Egypt. Most of your valuable suggestions and comments were taken in consideration in the revised manuscript. The conclusion section added. I am not agree, because I think the table describing the treatments is better. I am agree, but it is expected because the soil have high pH and CaCO₃ content.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		