

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_91300
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of long term soil test crop response based nutrient management in wheat (<i>Triticum aestivum</i> L.) on physical properties in a Vertisol
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:

(<https://www.journalijpss.com/index.php/IJPSS/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	This article is very well founded and organized. the manuscript is solid enough and technically solid because it presents the originality is very clear. But the conclusion has to be more detailed, it is not just saying that treatment 6 is adequate because the objective is a fundamental part of the structure of the article, it is where the objectives of the article are answered.	
Minor REVISION comments	In the introduction part, a reference is cited as anonymous, in particular, in this type of article there should be no anonymous authors because the idea is that other researchers can use their article for information. Bibliographical references constitute a set of detailed and precise data for the identification of a documentary source, printed or not, from which the information was obtained. The anonymous author should not exist in the bibliography because it would make it difficult for the reader to locate it.	
Optional/General comments	The article is very well founded and organized, which has its originality, but the conclusion needs to be improved, it needs to be more detailed.	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Rolando Mamani Quispe
Department, University & Country	Universidad Mayor de San Andres (UMSA), Bolivia