

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_102855
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Phosphorus and Sulphur on growth, protein content, yield and economics of Black gram (Vigna Mungo 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)
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 but needs a major review Yes Yes but address the concerns raised in the document No. The results and discussion need to be corrected. Presentation of the results could be done to reflect the experimental design used (factorial) Yes No. most of the references are far too old (more than a decade). The author must cite current literature to support their argument unless it is protocol or standard literature	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Needs revision	
Optional/General comments	Author should address concerns about the data analysis and discussion of the results. If possible, relook at the style of presentation of the results	

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>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Kennedy Agyeman
Department, University & Country	CSIR-Crops Research Institute, Ghana