



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Plant Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_APRJ_67474
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparison of Broadcast and Row Planting Methods on Growth, Grain yield and Yield Components of Wheat (<i>Triticum aestivum</i> L.) in winter cropping season, Khost Province, Afghanistan
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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/journal/10/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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Some punctuation marks are missing. For instance, a "." is lost in the second line of the first para of the introduction. Please check the full paper carefully. 2. "kg ha-1 " should be written in "kg-ha-1". Please check the full paper carefully. 3. " days to heading (DH), and Days to maturity (DM) " should be added in line seven of 2.2. 4. In table 3, there are two "DH 50%". I speculate the second should be "DH 100%". 	
Minor REVISION comments	Please don't cite too many references to support your opinion. eg. "Our results were in harmony with the previous findings that row planting method produced higher yield compare to broadcast methods [3, 4, 12, 16, and 18]", i think two or three references is ok.	
Optional/General comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The correlation coefficient between DH50% and 100% is 0.92. why the difference of DH50% can not cause the variety of DH50% 2. Please rearrange the references. 	



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Xiangjun Kong</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Henan Institute of Science and Technology, Chin</i>