

Review Form 3

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name: | International Journal of Plant & Soil Science |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_IJPSS_123028 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Effect of NPK and growth regulators on growth and development of wheat (<i>Triticum aestivum</i> L.) |
| Type of the Article | |

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

| Compulsory REVISION comments | Reviewer's comment | Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here) |
|--|---|---|
| Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part. | NPK (Nitrogen, Phosphorus, Potassium) is crucial for plant growth, providing essential nutrients that drive photosynthesis, energy transfer, and overall development. Plant regulators, or hormones, modulate growth, stress responses, and developmental processes. The use of plant regulators may help in help in increasing the yield of crops if used with proper agronomic practices. | |
| Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) | Title can be better with corrections in scientific name of wheat Effect of NPK and growth regulators on growth and productivity of wheat (<i>Triticum aestivum</i> L.) | |
| Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here. | Abstract can be better Discuss the results of growth and yield both and compare with Treatment T9 and control both | |
| Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? | Manuscript has unnecessary spacing and need improvement in manuscript writing | |
| Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part. | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Spacing is not mentioned in the paper (plant population is very high) 2. Reasoning and Refences missing w.r.t. all growth parameters 3. Grain yield and straw yield need to be checked (grain to straw ratio is very high) 4. CGR is not according to Dry matter 5. No link of the crop with NPK and growth regulators mentioned in the introduction 6. Formulas (CGR &RGR) methodology is not properly written 7. References at end are missing from the text | |
| Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Reasoning and Refences missing w.r.t. all growth parameters , Biological yield and harvesting index 2. References at end are missing from the text | |
| Minor REVISION comments | | |
| Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | Revision in language/English quality is needed | |
| Optional/General comments | The recommended dose itself is the optimum dose required by the plant if the plant is showing significant repose to higher doses the recommended dose need to be evaluated in that particular type of soil Kindly mention the amount of NPK applied to soil | |

Review Form 3

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------|
| Name: | Kanik Kumar Bansal |
| Department, University & Country | SKUAST, India |