

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_120847
Title of the Manuscript:	RESPONSE OF NANO DAP ON YIELD AND NUTRIENT CONTENT OF WHEAT GROWN IN LOAMY SAND SOIL
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The treatment with regard sandy loamy soil. It gives measure to correct the application of DAP in these farms.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	<u>Yes</u>	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	<u>Yes</u>	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	<u>Please write your manuscript according to research pedagogy.</u>	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	CD is very low. Although statistical analysis is correct. Please improve.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	<u>Updated references make a good impact on the manuscript.</u>	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Review Form 3

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:	Sandeep Bhardwaj
Department, University & Country	CCS Haryana Agricultural University, India