

SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_119107
Title of the Manuscript:	Response of quinoa to different levels of spacing and fertilizer
Type of Article :	

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
<p>Authors should ideally respond to every reviewer's suggestion in-depth, point-by-point. This work currently lacks any publication guidelines, ethics, values, and standards.</p> <p>There was no academic writing style employed during the building of this work. The majority of the scientific requirements (scientific standards) were not considered by the author when preparing, and drafting this manuscript (each section of your work). The authors raise many interesting points, which makes it difficult for the reader to follow their main argument. I recommend that the authors determine what their main argument is and structure their manuscript accordingly. A clearer theoretical stance will increase the quality of the manuscript. The authors were unable to address the issue of study aims because the original content was so utterly meaningless and disorganized. I could not find a single cohesive concept or strong argument in your manuscript. The procedures used in the methodology section are erroneous, and not all of the details is supported by any present-day resources. The statistical analysis is not supported by major specific details. This work was composed as a rough draft. Also, the discussion that took place was extremely disorganized and useless. Their abstract, introduction, discussion and conclusion were poorly written. The entire subject was disorganized, and I couldn't find almost any organization or explanation that seemed logical. This manuscript has too many structural issues, which makes it hard to follow the argument. This manuscript contains an elaborate literature review, but definitions of the key concepts are needed in the introduction. Unfortunately, the language and sentence structures of this manuscript are at times incomprehensible. There are a number of verbs and phrases that are repeated throughout the text. For a good peer review, the article requires extensive language editing and a complete rewrite.</p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Shahira H. EL-Moslamy
Department, University & Country	Genetic Engineering and Biotechnology Research Institute, City of Scientific Research and Technological Applications, Egypt