

Review Form 1.7

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name: | Asian Journal of Soil Science and Plant Nutrition |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_AJSSPN_116151 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Spacing, fertilizer and PGPR on yield and nutrient uptake in industrial hemp (<i>Cannabis sativa</i> ssp. <i>sativa</i>) and chemical properties of soil |
| Type of the 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.journalajsspn.com/index.php/AJSSPN/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>Compulsory 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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p> | <p>The manuscript important and relevant to the scientific world due to its originality and contribution to scientific literature on hemp</p> <p>The title reflects the work done and reported</p> <p>Yes, the abstract is a miniature part of the article</p> <p>Yes, the subsections are appropriate</p> <p>The manuscript appears to be sound and correct</p> <p>The references are sufficient</p> | |
| <p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p> | Yes | |
| <p>Optional/General comments</p> | <p>1. All abbreviations must be written in full the first time</p> <p>2. The author might consider tabulation of the experimental protocol for clarity and repeatability</p> <p>3. The legend for tables and figures are misplaced</p> <p>4. As tables speak for themselves, repetition of figures is monotonous</p> <p>5. Interpretation of results is commendable</p> | |

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) |
|---|---|---|
| <p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p> | <p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p> | |

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|----------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Name: | Mtaita Tuarira |
| Department, University & Country | Africa University, Zimbabwe |