

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_98304
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of foliar potassic application and irrigation levels growth, yield and nutrient content of mungbean
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:

(<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 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	Yes. Yes No All details are given inside the manuscript in comment boxes. Please see more related articles for some fineness in the work yes Many topics are not explained properly please see comments enclosed. Subsections are abrupt titles. Introduction is way too long conclusions are very very poorly drawn. There are over 400 grammatical mistakes kindly redo. One section highlighted in yellow is not at all acceptable. please redo. Please give a study area map with lat long.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Average	
Optional/General comments	The whole article needs to be completely redone.	

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:	Usha Chirala
Department, University & Country	Andhra University, India