



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Soil Science and Plant Nutrition
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJSSPN_47817
Title of the Manuscript:	Possibility of Allelopathic and Residues Effects of The Rotated Crops on Productivity, Chemical Composition, Nitrogen Utilization of Wheat and Soil Fertility
Type of the Article	<u>Review Paper</u>

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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

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	<p>The manuscript Possibility of Allelopathic and Residues Effects of The Rotated Crops on Productivity, Chemical Composition, Nitrogen Utilization of Wheat and Soil Fertility needs a major revision of English. There are a lot of mistakes that complicates the understanding of the text. Other corrections that are needed:</p> <p>TITLE: The title should be amended to facilitate a better understanding. We recommend that the title include the scientific name of the specie.</p> <p>ABSTRACT: An abstract is to be provided, preferably no longer than 250 words briefly specifying what is the problem being addressed, which solution is being proposed, the aims of the work, the main results obtained, and the conclusions drawn.</p> <p>INTRODUCTION: The introduction not provides a brief review of relevant literature and not contains embedded justification for the research. The introduction can should be ends with a brief and general overview of key results. The goal should be amended to facilitate a better understanding.</p> <p>MATERIALS AND METHODS: Materials and Methods should provide sufficient detail so that procedures are well understood and can be repeated.</p> <p>RESULTS AND DISCUSSION: The Results is poor. You should a clear presentation of experimental results obtained, highlighting any trends or points of interest. The discussion is too short, and the conclusions poor, please elaborate more them.</p>	<p>Corrected and effected</p> <p>Revised as stated</p> <p>Correction made</p> <p>Revision done as suggested</p> <p>We have reworked on the discussion section</p>
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

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)	