

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_84661
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of date of sowing and nitrogen levels on spot blotch disease of wheat caused by Bipolaris sorokiniana
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 (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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>The way the introduction is conducted according to me needs readjustment. Moreover, at its end, I did not see the goal targeted by the present studies.</p> <p>For the different Titles, the author must be careful with their size (as showed for instance by “abstract and introduction”).</p> <p>I suggest to the author to organise the different sections built up as follow: Abstract I. Introduction II. Material and methods III. Results and discussion III-1. Results III-2. Discussion IV. Conclusion References</p> <p>I think that some figures are in the need of titles (as in page 4).</p> <p>I suggest also to the author to use instead of the name of the authors cited in the text, but digits to which he will combine the name of the given author in the References section.</p> <p>This manuscript faces a recurrent problem of punctuation. This makes difficult its understanding.</p> <p>The structuring of sentences is sometimes really problematic.</p> <p>In the results and discussion part, one may gainfully start by presenting a given result with reference to figures or/and tables if possible. After this, its analysis must be done in relation to itself first, then in relation to the other results obtained in the same field by other researchers to be cited. At the end, an interpretation is done in order to justify the result obtained. While doing this, links can be created when possible between one's results; <i>for instance: the concentration of nitrogen in soils is consistent with the plant firmness</i></p>	Comment accepted and considered
Minor REVISION comments	Be careful with the spacing between words and misspellings.	Noted
Optional/General comments	The idea justifying the present research is pertinent. The results are relevant. But the punctuation and the sentences structuring are unfortunately problematic for the entire manuscript.	Comment accepted and considered

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	