

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_91527
Title of the Manuscript:	Effects of Blended NPSB Fertilizer Rates on Growth, Yield and Yield Components of Bread Wheat (<i>Triticum aestivum</i> L.) Varieties on Jimma Arjo District, Western Ethiopia
Type of the Article	Short communication

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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Introduction. Production data form year 2016 are provided. Please update the information by using current FAO statistical databases. 2. Materials and Methods. Description of the experimental site. Please provide geographic coordinates of the experimental site, rather than the name of neighbor towns/cities. 3. Materials nd Methods. Climate. Provide description of the climate at the specific site or region where the trial was carried out. Please mention the frame time (year/month) when the experiment was established. 4. Materials and Methods. Authors applied a uniform supplement of fertilizer to the treatments, except for the control. Why was the control excluded? 5. Materials and Methods. Economic analysis. Include a foot note for showing the exchange rate UTB:US Dollars. 6. Results and Discussion. The first couple of paragraphs of this section are misplaced, this information does not correspond to experimental data; thus, it should be included into the Materials and Methods section for describing the soils of the experimental site. 7. Results and Discussion. Information provided in Tables is unnecessarily repeated in text. In this section preferably discuss trends and provide explanations on the underlying causes of those results. 8. Conclusion. The first four lines of this section do not correspond to true conclusions. Information on soil properties was not experimental data. It was not included in the objectives of the study. Results are only applicable to the area where they were obtained. 	
Minor REVISION comments	English writing should be revised by a native speaker of that language.	
Optional/General comments	The study was presumably established in a single environment and year, which constitutes a substantial weakness. The manuscript does not meet the level of rigor necessary to be considered a scientific article. In case of acceptance, it should be published as a scientific note.	

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:	Amalio Santacruz-Varela
Department, University & Country	Colegio de Postgraduados, Mexico