Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**International Journal of Plant & Soil Science**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_IJPSS_85755**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Evaluating the Productivity of some Barely Genotypes under Deficient Water Application in Clayey Soils**
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	The abstract needs to provide introduction before jumping into the experiment set up description. In many instances, the use of long and convoluted sentences cause distraction, authors are urged to breakdown any long sentence in the manuscript The work needs to be proofread, authors may use Grammerly to detect the issue if they cannot hire a native speaking proof-reader. There are a lot issues that need to be addressed. In-text citations (Farag et al. [12]). Need to be revised, their numbering order is not correct they start with number 24 and the name of authors- both versions cannot be used. For instance, in the case of (Snyderet al. [39]) the author name s should be removed and only number [39] gets used. Full integration in the keywords does not make any sense. The objective description needs to be clearer than the existing form. One line space is required between paragraphs The font sizes are inconsistent in the tables – please use a uniform font size and style I suggest that authors create a diagram showing their research process. Subheading of 3.2 should change, it should be related to the findings not analysis. Something similar to 3.3 The conclusions section should not be merely the summary of the findings, the research implications, limitations of the research and contribution to the body of knowledge should be included in this section. References at the end of the manuscript are not styled consistently. Please review and use the following studies in the literature review of the manuscript https://academicjournals.org/journal/AJAR/article-full-text-pdf/50444D929110 https://academicjournals.org/journal/AJAR/article-full-text-pdf/086746437207 http://biozoojournals.ro/swjhbe/v2n2/04.swjhbe.v2n2.Ghani.pdf	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Salman Shooshtarian**
Department, University & Country	**RMIT University, Australia**