

Review Form 3

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name: | International Journal of Plant & Soil Science |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_IJPSS_127450 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Effect of Different Nitrogen Levels and Nano Urea on Yield and Economics of Wheat under Mid Hills of Himachal Pradesh |
| 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>

PART 1: Review Comments

| Compulsory REVISION comments | Reviewer's comment | Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i> |
|---|--|--|
| 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 manuscript represents an excellent and expansive contribution into the field of effect of different nitrogen levels and nano urea on yield and economics of wheat. The scientific value of manuscript is undeniable. | |
| Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) | Yes | |
| 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. | No ; Abstract should begin with a sentence regarding the importance and necessity of the research | |
| Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? | Yes | |
| 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. | Originality and Methods: The research seems original with reliable quantitative research methodologies used for data collection. Results: Results of the study are credible consistent with the objectives of the study. Interpretation and conclusions: Results interpretation, discussion and conclusion are credible. References: some references cited in the manuscript old . | |
| Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. | No | |
| Minor REVISION comments | Yes | |
| Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | | |
| Optional/Gneral 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: | Salih Kadhum Alwan Alsharifi |
| Department, University & Country | AlQasim Green University, Iraq |