

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_97240
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Intercropping Systems with Different Levels of Sulphur on Protein content, Nitrogen uptake and Yield Attributes of Mungbean
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)	Yes. The manuscript idea is very good regarding to study the effect of Intercropping Systems with Different Levels of Sulphur on Yield Yes. No, it need more explanation for materials and methods, and results. Yes. Yes. Yes.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes.	
Optional/General comments	Introduction is very good. Materials and methods: is this simple experiment or factorial, and where is the twenty combinations treatments. discussion is very poor .	

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Abdelmonnem S. Kahlel
Department, University & Country	Northern Technical University, Iraq