

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Plant &amp; Soil Science</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Original Manuscript_IJPSS_117874</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Effect of planting time and spacing on yield and quality of garlic (<i>Allium sativum</i> L.) cv. Anand Kesari</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Paper</b>

### 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.journalijpss.com/index.php/IJPSS/editorial-policy> )

### 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>Yes, the research and manuscript is crucial for the community and farmers.</b></p> <p>2. <b>No, the title should be formal and should reflect the objective also. I have suggested the proper title onto the manuscript comment.</b></p> <p>3. <b>No, Abstract is incomplete. Must add more information.</b></p> <p>4. <b>Yes, main sections are correct. However, should add more subsections into materials and methods.</b></p> <p>5. <b>Yes, I think manuscript is scientifically correct.</b></p> <p>6. <b>No, there are only 11 references and should contain a minimum of 30 references. Out of 11 old references are 3.</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>	<p>Yes, the language is good to read but need to enhance the formal language</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>1. You must add references and make it up to 30 and above. References must be recent i.e. use references which has published after 2010.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Chandan Shreevastav</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Institute of Agriculture and Animal Science (IAAS), Tribhuvan University (TU), Nepal</b>