

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_97642
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Nitrogen and Spacing on growth and yield of Sunflower (<i>Helianthus annuus</i> L.)
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		
<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. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Yes Yes No No Yes Yes</p> <p>The introduction is written structurally, without referring to the names of the researchers who found or deduced this information from their studies, and therefore this information has no value or importance. The results and discussion are only two parts, the first part is very long and boring, and the researcher must rewrite this part and divide it into separate paragraphs and discuss them clearly. The second part of the results and discussion is very brief and the researcher did not discuss these results and give convincing explanations. The researcher used 9 references in this research, one reference in the materials and work methods and 8 of them in the results and discussion, while 66 references were mentioned in the list of references.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
Optional/General comments		

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:	Yousif H. Alnaser
Department, University & Country	College of Agriculture and Forestry, University of Mosul, Iraq