

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_95821
Title of the Manuscript:	Macronutrient Status and Soil Chemical Properties as Influenced by Methods and Schedule of Fertilizer Application Under Widely Spaced Sugarcane Crop (<i>Saccharum officinarum</i> L.) in Alfisols of Karnal District, Haryana
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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. The manuscript has relevance at local and regional scales;</p> <p>2. Appropriate manuscript title;</p> <p>3. Yes, the Abstract is comprehensive;</p> <p>4. The numbering of the subsections must be reorganized (Incorrect numbering);</p> <p>5. The manuscript is scientifically correct; however, it needs occasional adjustments;</p> <p>6. The number of references is adequate.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The manuscript is interesting and has relevance at local and regional scales, however, it needs adjustments. As it is a scientific article, there is a need to perform statistical procedures, the same was done by the authors, however, the data analysis procedures (statistics) were not described by the authors. Before being accepted for publication, the manuscript needs to undergo adjustments. Some recommendations can be found in the attached file (paper file).</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>No comments.</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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Pedro Luan Ferreira da Silva
Department, University & Country	Universidade Estadual de Maringá, Brazil