



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJAST_18831
Title of the Manuscript:	Increasing Fruit Set, Yield and Fruit Quality of "Canino" Apricot Trees under Two Different soil Conditions
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/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI 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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	- In page 3, super scripts and subscripts in chemical formulas were not used properly. It should be compulsorily changed. We have to follow international standards. - In page 4, there is no proper formatting. - In page 9, in place of data it was given as date.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	- In page 2, spaces were used in chemical formulas (Ca O or Ca Cl₂). It should be corrected. - In page 3, particle size distribution was given. But what basis it was classified. Justification is needed. - In page 3, Units for macro & micro nutrients were given as mg/kg soil-1. But what about soil-2?	Ok , I do all. Thanks sir I do not need to define the classifition of analysis that has been done because what I care about is the chemical analysis of the soil macro & micro nutrients were given as mg/kg soil for both soil 1 &2



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments	• Lot of formatting/typing errors are there in abstract. In some sentences there is no space between words, at some places un necessarily comma is used. • It is found that uniform format is not used for citing the references. It is required to use the same notation/format for the references.	
---	--	--