



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_46784
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of nitrogen, phosphorous and potash on yield attributes and quality of Sugar beet
Type of the Article	Researched,

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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Common cultivar's name added. 2. Key words should not be in italics. 3. The design of the experiment, Complete Randomized Block Design (CRBD) or Randomized Block Design (RBD)? That's in vivo or vitro. Verify. 4. Text to be in Times New Roman and double spacing with 12 font size. 5. Morphological, fertilizer and nutrients of the crop needs to be arranged in sequent most disjointed as appeared in the Introduction. 6. Soil test results after the experiments also needs to be presented, i.e. before and after. 7. Some references were in the text but not acknowledged, such as the ones underlined in red. Proper referencing format needs to be adopted. 8. Conclusion and recommendation. Needs improvement. 9. The Table needs proper discussion and should be placed appropriately. i.e. Discussion followed by Table discussed. 10. The topic may also needs to be reconsidered to accommodate all as suggested under the major one. 	All the corrections attended. Soil test result are already published in other journal.
Minor REVISION comments	It needs proper re arrangement of facts.	All the correction attended
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)	No ethical issue