

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_96529
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of spacing and manganese on Yield and Economics and Quality of sesame (Sesamum Indicum L.)
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.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 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. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	<p>The entire article needs to be reviewed by the author, starting up with the title, continuing with the Abstract, Materials and Methods and so on. Details of my recommendations can see on the manuscript.</p> <p>I suggest: Plant Spacing and Manganese Effects on Yield, Quality and Economic Indicators of Sesame (<i>Sesamum indicum</i> L.): Preliminary study.</p> <p>Unfortunately, the authors did not consider the Instructions for authors.</p> <p>No. For example: mainly Materials and Methods section needs to be redone.</p> <p>It needs to be improved.</p> <p>Instructions for authors have not been considered (as regard as citations) and there is no a correspondence between the citations and the Reference section content.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	I am not an English experimented specialist. But I appreciate that in some cases phrases need to be reformulated with a view to be clear understand by the reader.	
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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Delian Elena
Department, University & Country	University of Agronomic Sciences and Veterinary Medicine, Romania