

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
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.) varities
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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Indent all paragraphs consistently throughout the document. Refer to the journal template to see if you need a space between them. Do not give references in bold text. Give your objective(s) at the end of the introduction. Give location coordinates for the field site. Need letters report in the tables to show significance. Just showing standard error isn't descriptive enough. The first time you use an abbreviation, spell the whole term out. This goes for nutrients as well as measured factors in the report. Chart 1 is unnecessary; you do not use those symbols in the document after Chart 1. Format table headings consistently throughout the document. Need more in the conclusion. Statement for the need of further research and one paragraph will most likely not be enough for a peer reviewed journal. Check grammar usage carefully. The usage in this paper makes it difficult to interpret the research. No mention of statistical analysis.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Formatting and grammar need to be clear and consistent. Follow a journal template.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	This is a difficult paper to understand. The statistical analysis isn't even mentioned, and this is a big concern. With proper grammar, consistent formatting and a more thorough explanation of statistical analyses, this paper may be ready for publication.	

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:	James Burke
Department, University & Country	University of Arkansas, United States of America