

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Crop Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCS_93363
Title of the Manuscript:	Influence of organic and inorganic nitrogen on the growth and yield of wheat
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:

(<https://www.journalajrcs.com/index.php/AJRCS/editorial-policy>)

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	The work is very interesting, however, it presents an underlying problem that corresponds to how the data was analyzed, starting from the fact that it has a more complex design than the one proposed, the entire first part of the results was analyzed as a randomized ANOVA, without However, it is a factorial design in blocks with repeated measures and when separating it by factors, the results are masked, which presents a problem, especially when I later state that there is an interaction between said factors, this means that the manuscript in terms of results and discussion be reviewed further	
Minor REVISION comments	The summary is very long, a short introduction is required that sets out the problem to be addressed and the clear objective of the study, in the same way the results must show the most representative, on the other hand, when using a nomenclature such as T5, it must be clear from the start. the principle, in general the summary should be revised to improve. There are repeated ideas in the introduction which deserves to be revised There are acronyms that are used and common, but for a reader who is not familiar with the area they should be placed that mean	
Optional/General comments		

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Alexis Valery
Department, University & Country	Universidad Nacional Experimental del Táchira, Venezuela