

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_91657
Title of the Manuscript:	"INFLUENCE OF PANCHGAVYA AND JEEVAMRIT ON GROWTH, YIELD AND QUALITY OF TOMATO (Solanum lycopersicum L.)"
Type of the Article	Original research papers

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>)

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>According to the author's guidelines for the International Journal of Plant & Soil Science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Abstract: Does not comply with the sections assigned by objectives, study design, place, methodology, etc. • Sections: The authors require a detailed review of the guideline. <p>Material and methods</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shouldn't tables (1-5) go in results? Because it is presenting results with anova parameters (SE, CD) • The authors must describe the methodology correctly, there are parts of results that should go in the methodological part. For example, describe that measurements were made at the height of the plant at 30, 60 and 90 days (does not appear in the methodology). Add the type of analysis to be applied. What parameters will be evaluated and maybe why those. <p>Results & Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the results it is necessary to describe more, there is content of tables but there is no text that makes references to them, on the other hand, it seems that it describes only the statistical part, however it does not mention which are significantly different in the treatments, it makes them understand that the treatment 8 was the best and the witness was the worst. So the other treatments are significant or not. • I think that the discussion part should be improved, it only mentions that such an author gave similar results, at least make a slight description of the connection with the cited author. <p>References The following bibliographies are cited in the text:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • - Ashok, pal., and Shashi, Bala., (2020) • - Phatak, R.K. and Ram, R.A. (2013). • - Robin Rijal, Adesh Kumar*, Priyanka Maity, Siddhant Kumar Bisoyi, Subrata Chattarjee And Rakesh Nelli (2021). • - Sanjiv Yadav, Amit Kanawjia, Rajkumar Chaurasiya, (2019) <p>Citations that do not come in the references:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • -Gamma, 2015. • - Sreenivasa et al. 2009. • - Paleker (2006) • - Sreenivasa et al. 2010. • - Arivazhagan et al (2019). • - Robin et al (2020). • -Kachave (2019) <p>The others are found in the references but are not cited.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	<p>Suggestion: In the economic section, add also the part of the other treatments, and if possible, the cost of production of the treatments. Being different variables, the results can be better appreciated graphically.</p>	

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Miguel Armando López Beltrán
Department, University & Country	Autonomous University of Sinaloa, México