

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Soil Science and Plant Nutrition
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJSSPN_101374
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of soil amendments and spraying with antioxidants on some clay soil properties and wheat production under climate change conditions
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.journalajsspn.com/index.php/AJSSPN/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>Yes. The manuscript is important for the scientific community and also for society as a whole, especially for farmers. Additionally, it is very clear and understandable.</p> <p>Yes, it is very clear.</p> <p>Yes, the abstract is correctly structured.</p> <p>Yes, I'm sure.</p> <p>Yes, it's correct.</p> <p>Yes. There are many current references. Incidentally, the Author has provided a substantial number of references.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>I managed to spot some minor grammatical errors and double spaces between words. Therefore, I suggest that the Author make a careful revision of the text.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>In all data tables presented, the line corresponding to the F test contains asterisks (**). However, the Author does not explain the reason for not having entered values.</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:	Alexandre Ricardo Pereira Schuler
Department, University & Country	Universidade Federal de Pernambuco, Brasil