

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_88537
Title of the Manuscript:	Influence of micronutrients (Boron and Zinc) on uptake and availability of nutrients
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 core principle of this work is sound, but 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. What statistical software was used in this study? Please utilize statistical analysis to support anything you've said. There is no any photos or figures and conclusion section. The conclusion section was merged with discussion one of this manuscript; however, I believe it should generally be stated as a separate paragraph. The writer listed all the titles with their findings in the results and discussion section, but did not discuss each point independently. This study employed the oldest references to support their methods, observations and discussion. In their images and charts, I couldn't find any organization or detailed explanation were a shambles. Besides that, the discussion section was a total mess (meaningless). As a result, I am unable to accept the work in its current form because it lacks scientific value for readers.	
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