

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ IJPSS_89382
Title of the Manuscript:	Row spacing, levels of fertilizers and genotypes influencing growth, nutrient uptake and yield of sugarcane (Saccharum spp.) grown under calcareous soil
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.journalijecc.com/index.php/IJECC/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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The last sentence of the abstract [From line number 23 (The results demonstrate that.....)] can be structured in a better manner for making the concept understandable for the readers. 2. The author/s is/are suggested to follow the manuscript submission guidelines for citing the references in the manuscript text (format for citing the references in manuscript). 3. Line no. 59 [Nitrogenous fertilizer.....] doesn't hold any justification in the context. Either author/s can cite the concept or can provide a justification for this context. 4. A many of the content/information in the Introduction part which is not the outcome of the research has been mentioned by the author without any citation. It is suggested to either provide a proper citation or it can be presented with proper justification related to the author's original research outcome. 5. The literature survey in contrast with the title of the article, and the parameters of the research is not sufficient. 6. The justification/proof in line no. 78-81 in section "2" is missing. (Author can include some geo-tagged photographs) 7. In the line no. 98(Planting was done.....), 114 authors are requested to express the cropping duration in no. of days/weeks/months instead of using any arbitrary units. 8. Line no. 108, 121 the equations used in the manuscript doesn't hold any justification/background from the research derivation. Author/s must include the same or proper citations of these equations are mandatory. 9. Line 21. Author/s must take care for the proper citation format as per the journal guideline/s. 10. In the section "3" from line no. 134, it is suggested to the author/s to include only their own research outcomes and the comparison of the outcome with the past research can be done in a proper way either in this section and the same can be concluded in the conclusion part as well, instead of mentioning the outcome of past research. The same can be done in the introduction / survey section. 11. Line no. 175, "T" should not be in Caps. 12. It is suggested to the author/s to include photographs (minimal) of the primary procedures for proof & justification. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The last sentence of the abstract has been structured in a better manner. 2. I have followed the manuscript submission guidelines for citing the references as much as possible. 3. Provided the justification for this context. 4. Either provided the proper citation or removed the part which is not the outcome of the research. 5. I tried to make the literature survey in contrast with the title of the article. 6. Geo tagged photographs not available. 7. Suggestion inserted. 8. Citation added in equation and proper justification also included in the respective line/paragraph. 9. Proper citation format inserted in the text. 10. Own research outcomes included as per suggestions as far as possible. 11. "t" inserted in the text. 12. Photographs not inserted because of the paper may look messy. However, meteorological data has been depicted in graphical form (fig.1).
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Author/s are suggested to include the soil test report of the site in any format. 2. In the section "3" → Results and Discussions, Author can use some graphical representation/s to provide a better depiction to the reader by dipping the messy volume of the manuscript. 3. As lot of parameters has been used to compare in this research, its good to bullet the concrete conclusion of the research for better understanding for the readers. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Soil test report of the experimental site has been included in tabular form (Table 1). 2. Graphical study not done so didn't include. 3. Concrete conclusion of the research has been depicted.
Optional/General comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Any ethical certification for conducting the research should be submitted as per the Journal / Publisher's requirement. 2. It has been requested to the editor for checking the plagiarism entity and all other formats as per the journal/publisher's requirements. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No any ethical issues while conducted the research.

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)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No, there are no any ethical issues in this manuscript.