

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_93699
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECT OF SOURCES AND LEVELS OF SULPHUR ON QUALITY, NUTRIENT CONTENT AND UPTAKE OF SUMMER COWPEA (<i>Vigna unguiculata</i> L. Walp.) UNDER SOUTH GUJARAT CONDITION
Type of the 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:

(<https://www.journalijpss.com/index.php/IJPSS/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	The introduction was poorly written and left out important information. The oldest references are found in the methods and materials section, which is also the shortest and lacks necessary details. Please tabulate your treatment's codes. The Methodology section is also ineffective and deficient in crucial details and data. Besides, the results and discussion section started with the statistical analysis results that were not mentioned in the materials and methods section. What statistical software was used in this study? Please utilize statistical analysis to support anything you've said. The presentation is so poor, and the language is a jumble of weak sentences. There are several verbs and sentences that have been repeated more than once. The writers were unable to address the research objectives issue because there are no longer any modes of action that are well-supported by graphics. The authors were unable to effectively respond to the original study's main question by covering essential subtopics. The writer listed all the titles with their findings in the results and discussion section, but did not discuss each point independently. I couldn't find any organization or detailed explanation were a shambles. Besides that, the discussion section was a total mess (meaningless).	
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)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Shahira H. EL-Moslamy
Department, University & Country	Genetic Engineering and Biotechnology Research Institute, City of Scientific Research and Technological Applications, Egypt