

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Plant &amp; Soil Science</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJPSS_111643</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Influence of Methods of sowing and organic manures on Growth, Yield and Economics of wheat (<i>Triticum aestivum</i> L.)</b>
Type of the Article	

### 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. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>1. <b>As addressed in the introductory section, the article contains scientific merit.</b></p> <p>2. <b>Suggestion to revise title into "Influence of various methods of sowing and organic manures on the productivity of wheat (<i>Triticum aestivum</i> L.)"</b></p> <p>3. <b>The manuscript is comprehensive; however, non-technical phrases were observed. Please checked the manuscript, I had edited some of these phrases (do track changes).</b></p> <p>4. <b>Please see manuscript (track changes), as I took the liberty of editing some incomprehensible phrases that were observed in the manuscript. I suggest the authors to re-read full manuscript and also find similar phrases as I might miss some of this.</b></p> <p>5. <b>Data presented showed scientifically consistent result.</b></p> <p>6. <b>References used is sufficient and recent enough.</b></p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	Some grammatical inconsistency were observed all throughout the article. An English language proficient expert could be of help.	
<b>Optional/General</b> 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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Bryan Glomel S. Silverio</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Science and Technology of Southern Philippines, Philippines</b>