

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_104710
Title of the Manuscript:	Growth characteristics, yield components and yield of wheat (<i>Triticum aestivum</i> L.) as affected by integrated nutrient management on under central plain zone of Uttar Pradesh
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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Yes, it is important with modification of the given comments</p> <p>Yes indeed</p> <p>Not compressive (needs some modification as per the given comment)</p> <p>Most of them are appropriate</p> <p>Yes, with some major revision</p> <p>Adding more recent references is recommended</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? Needs revision 	<p>It is highly recommended to have the paper grammar-checked and undergo stylistics and editing.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.Needs strong Justification (eg. what was the gap to be complement by this study) 2.no recommendation 3.no Cost benefit analyses 	<p>Follow the author guidelines.</p>	

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>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mohamed Khamar
Department, University & Country	Mohammed V University in Rabat, Morocco