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<thead>
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<th>Reviewer's comment</th>
<th>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)</th>
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| **Compulsory REVISION comments** | Abstract and Introduction  
- Remove (from which treatments ) replace with designated as ..  
- Remove was recorded maximum plant height add gave the tallest plants.  
- Remove Medik a name given by the German botanist medikus in 1778 (Cubero, 1981)  
- which can adapt correct it to could  
- Not found in Ref. 1- (FAO STAT 2014).  
- Correct (significantly effecting ) to (significantly affecting).  
- Remove (efficiency of plants to photosynthesis).  
- MATERIALS AND METHODS  
- Change (Each treatment net plot size is 3m x 3m) to (Each treatment net plot size is 9m$^2$ (3 x 3m)  
- Recommended dose and letter (s), recommended dose.  
- Change (The Lentil crop was harvested treatment wise at harvesting maturity stage) to (The lentil crop was harvested at maturity stage).  
- RESULTS AND DISCUSSION  
T9 ((Phosphorus 50 kg/ha+ Zinc 0.75%) , it is correct in the first time, then write it as (T9) only without details. Also, - 1 correct T8.  
- Original Research Article  
- Influence of Phosphorus on Growth and Yield of Promising Varieties of Lentil (Lens culinaris L. Medik )  
- Table 1 : add T1 before Phosphorus 30 kg/ha + Zinc 0.25% to become: T1: Phosphorus 30 kg/ha------ then add T2, T3------- before the corresponding treatments.  
- Table 2 : Contains the same values of No of Pods- No of Seeds and Test weight (g). They should be deleted from Table 2. These results were similar with that of Abid et al., (2017) must be corrected perfectly to Ali et al(2017). |
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