Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**International Journal of Plant & Soil Science**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_IJPSS_86150**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Growth and Production of Wheat (Triticum aestivum L.) as Influenced by Levels and Methods of N P K Fertilizer Application in Arid Region of Rajasthan**
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	I find the title a bit ambiguous. I suggest the following title: "Influence of different Levels and Methods of N P K Fertilizer Application on the Growth and Production of Wheat (Triticum aestivum L.) in Arid Region of Rajasthan". The scientific nature of the article is good and it could contribute to knowledge. However, the experimentation and data collection protocol are not clearly defined, and the results are poorly presented both in the abstract and in the main text. The objectives of the study are not clearly established in the Introduction section. More and recent citations should be added to the context and the discussion. The Materials and Methods section should be split into several subchapters. The 20 treatments applied should be well presented; I suggest that this be done in table form. A descriptive diagram of the experimental design is required. The statistical analyses performed should be clearly defined and their results presented in the text: the test(s) name(s) and statistics significance (Degree of freedom, F-value, P-value, etc.). Globally, the results should be presented better, using simple sentences and in logical agreement with the methods applied. I would also suggest separating the results from the discussion. The discussion and conclusion are very weak. I suggest to complete the discussion with more detailed comparisons with previous studies. The author should not rely only on studies done in India. The conclusion should present the main considerations that emerge from the study and potential future developments.	
Minor REVISION comments	I suggest the author use short and concise sentences; Rephrase some sentences; Define all terms before abbreviation; Adapting a unique form of reference presentation according to the type in the bibliographic reference list and in the text; Ensure that the references listed are in the text.	
Optional/General comments	I hope the author finds my comments helpful. The only goal is to improve the paper. I believe that all the ingredients are present, it just remains to use them well to make a good sauce.	

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:	**Yao Anicet Gervais Kouamé**
Department, University & Country	**Université Nangui Abrogoua, Côte d'Ivoire**