

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Plant &amp; Soil Science</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJPSS_96866</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>INFLUENCE OF SILICON AND PHOSPHORUS ON YIELD AND NUTRIENT CONTENT OF WHEAT IN LOAMY SAND SOILS OF NORTH GUJARAT</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### **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> )

## Review Form 1.7

### 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><b>Compulsory</b> 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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. The manuscript entitled "INFLUENCE OF SILICON AND PHOSPHORUS ON YIELD AND NUTRIENT CONTENT OF WHEAT IN LOAMY SAND SOILS OF NORTH GUJARAT" has relevance to the agronomic scientific community. However, it is necessary to review some fundamental topics to elaborate the hypotheses and the object of the research.</p> <p>2. Title: It is necessary to adapt the title more consistently and objectively, especially in the aspect in the region/country where the study was conducted.</p> <p>3. The summary is not clear to the overall objective of the research. However, I recommend writing the proposed objective clearly and consistently. In addition, I suggest completing the abstract a brief synthesis of the research, highlighting the main result addressed.</p> <p>4. The introduction should contextualize the problem and/or the need for research. However, the authors do not report the hypotheses for the study of the influence of silicon and phosphorus on wheat yield and nutrient content in sand soils. In addition, I suggest that the authors make a synthesis of the subject addressing the main agronomic foundations in the study of the target species of the proposal.</p> <p>5. Yes, the manuscript has scientific merit for publication. However, it is necessary to review the concepts of the methodology addressed, especially in statistical analysis, because the authors do not point out the level of significance, as well as do not mention the type of software used in data analysis. Therefore, it is important to review the experimental design in factorial (indicate which types of factors are analyzed). In relation to the results and discussion of the work, I suggest that the authors highlight the main relevant aspect of the research, that is, when compared to the other studies already published? I suggest that the authors can make clear in the results. The conclusion of the research should be aligned with the objective of the work. Has the goal been achieved? If so, make that clear to readers. The conclusion section is something that does not need to highlight the results, as this should be discussed in the previous section.</p> <p>6. The authors used updated references, as well as cited classical references that have scientific authority in the research object. In general, the manuscript needs to be reviewed based on the comments and suggestions proposed in the printed document, before proceeding to final publication.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Yes	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	Not	

### 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>	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Daniel da Silva
Department, University & Country	Instituto Nacional de Pesquisas da Amazônia, Brazil