

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Plant &amp; Soil Science</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJPSS_119107</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Response of quinoa to different levels of spacing and fertilizer</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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li><b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li><b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li><b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>The work has the potential to have a significant impact in the field, but the results are not sufficiently supported by experimental data, and the write-up, experimental work, and accompanying discussion are insufficiently deep. You should use a single font and writing style for all of your content.</p> <p>There are numerous written content disruptions in your article. 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.</p> <p>This work was composed as a rough draft. In the badly written and disorganized areas of your manuscript, you made numerous spelling and grammar errors. To support the writers' conclusions and points of view, the earliest references should also be included in the current work (the list of references is inadequate and out of date). The authors also disregarded the conventions of good writing style and research methodology. Although your article's conclusion was combined with the discussion one, I think it should usually be addressed in a separate section. There wasn't enough specific information available regarding the effects of every aspect that were evaluated. There was not enough rationale or organizing concept that I could find. The manuscript was composed in an incomplete state. The most verbs and phrases are used repeatedly in the text. I cannot approve the work in its current state since it gives readers no scientific value.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></li> </ol>		
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</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><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**Reviewer Details:**

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