

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Soil Science and Plant Nutrition
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJSSPN_101734
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluating the response of wheat to spraying zinc and copper under mineral and organic nitrogen sources
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> <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's. But, it's need a reform the apresentation</p> <p>No. It does not reflect the main objectives of the manuscript. Title needs to emphasize comparison of nitrogen sources. Use of zn and Cu is not the most important</p> <p>Yes. It is. It is reflecting the content of the manuscript</p> <p>Yes. The authors were very creative in this division. Allows good follow-up</p> <p>Yes, I do. The authors used a split-plot methodology. It is necessary to demonstrate that the statistical analyzes followed this design. The way of presenting and discussing the results is not demonstrating the care that this environmental design requires.</p> <p>It is necessary to properly adjust the equation and demonstrate the effects of nutrient application.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>Yes. Easy-to-understand scientific language was used.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>This manuscript has scientific qualities that deserve to be disclosed. However, some improvements are needed, such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Express in the title the main objective, which was to study the effects of different nitrogen sources; -explain and justify additional treatments with Zn and Cu. Why were other micronutrients such as Iron and Boron not used? -Improve the general description of the experiment installation site by incorporating more detailed weather conditions such as precipitation and solar incidence. - detail cultural practices such as irrigation. - explain the regional use of the results, mainly emphasizing the choice of genetic material. 	

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	José Geraldo Mageste
Department, University & Country	Federal University of the Uberlândia, Brasil