

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_84190
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of seed rate and spacing on nutrient uptake in chickpea
Type of the Article	Original Research 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.journalijpss.com/index.php/IJPSS/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	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>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Please state need of the research and specific objective first in abstract• Better to add country name also in abstract and conclude the abstract with a take home message Introduction part is very poor Introduction part must contain <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Problem to be addressed• How problem originates• What management measures adopted in the past to address the proble• What were the limitations• How these limitations could be met• What management you are going to introduce stating gap from previous work done• Hypothesis with specific objective But you have discussed only problem nothing else In methodology <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Plan of work is not clear• Please give treatment plan• Methodology for application of treatments and other necessary agronomic measures• Some sentences need correction• what statistical approach was adopted to get information about the obtained results Results should be explained by comparing different seed rates and spacing separately and in combination There is no discussion in the manuscript at all. Discussion part must contain important results, reasoning and citation from previous work done but here in this manuscript there is no reasoning. Please give conclusion at the end of manuscript with a take home message and possible future directions	All the necessary corrections were done as indicated
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	There are several spelling and grammar mistakes that should be considered	Corrected
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	There are several spacing issues in the manuscript.	

Review Form 1.6

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