

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Journal of Plant &amp; Soil Science</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_88505
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Different Sowing Environment on Growth Parameters, Yield and Yield Components of Chickpea (Cicer aretinum L.) varieties
Type of the 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> )

### **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)
<b><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments	Material and methods section are not informative and addition of observations taken, analysis of data must be beneficial  From abstract is not clear for me what is the novelty and aim of the study. It should be better emphasized in the abstract.  The discussion section must be elaborated with recent findings and latest information	Noted and corrected
<b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments	Cross reference all of the citations in the text with the references in the reference section. Make sure that all references have a corresponding citation within the text and vice versa. Double check the spelling of the author names and dates and make sure they are correct and consistent with the citations. Spell out all abbreviations in the text the first time they are mentioned in the text. Spell out all journal titles in the reference section.  Reference list: Please check according to the rules of Journal.	Comment accepted and considered
<b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments	The topic of the manuscript is relevant to the publication policy of Journal The scientific quality of the work described in the manuscript is generally satisfactory.	Okay

### **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)	