

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_103818
Title of the Manuscript:	Influence of Panchgavya on Growth, Yield and Quality parameters of Bitter gourd (Momordica charantia L.)
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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1) It is a good manuscript for scientific community</p> <p>2) Appropriate</p> <p>3) Abstract can be modified in a well mannered structure. So that it convey the reader to grasp what author need to convey to the community</p> <p>4) one major suggestion is the results are just quoted directly by mentioning the values. It may get to the reader from the table itself. Results should be discussed by the author findings plus appropriate references. So that it sounds more better for the reader.</p> <p>5) Can check the on par readings also than just mentioning T11 is superior over others</p> <p>6) In results and discussions part the part can be discussed properly with recent references. It is completely lacking in this manuscript</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Repeated usage of few words like of with in a single sentence can be avoided. Few sentences can be modified</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>7) Introduction is too long. Materials used for preparation is mentioned in introduction part. My suggestion is to make brief introduction</p> <p>8) materials and methods can be detailed properly by adding method of preparation. references for calculation of TSS and ascorbic acid can also be added</p> <p>9) software used for analysis of statistics can be mentioned in materials and methods</p> <p>10) quantity of fertilizer applied and the N,P,K status can be updated</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Durga C.
Department, University & Country	Kerala Veterinary and Animal Science University, India