

Journal Name:	Journal of Global Ecology and Environment
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JOGEE_12544
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECT OF DIFFERENT DOSES OF NITROGEN PHOSPHORUS AND POTASSIUM ON GROWTH AND YIELD OF RICE CULTIVARS
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (<i>Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here</i>)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript investigates the effects of different doses of nitrogen phosphorus and potassium on the growth and yield of rice cultivars.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title of the manuscript is suitable.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The article has comprehensive abstract.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The entire sections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript's structure follows the scientific method.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are sufficient and recent.	

Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language/English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communication.	
Optional/General comments	Try to follow the comments and suggestions, which are remarked in word version in Track change in the word file. All revisions should be addressed carefully to improve the manuscript. There are no competing interest issues in this manuscript. No plagiarism has been suspected. PLEASE SEE ATTACHMENT	

PART 2:

	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>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Marwan Noori Ramadhan
Department, University & Country	University of Basrah, Iraq