

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Plant &amp; Soil Science</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJPSS_102518</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Effect of Boron and Lime on Boron Transformation in a Fluvaquentic Humaquepts Soil Concerning Uptake and Yield of Green Gram</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### 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)
<b>Compulsory REVISION</b> comments  1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)  2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)  3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b>  4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>  5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b>  6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b>  <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b>	<p>The manuscript has importance for the scientific community.</p> <p>No. "Effect of different levels of boron and lime on boron fractions, uptake and yield of green gram (<i>Vigna radiata</i> L.)"</p> <p>The ABSTRACT needs to be made more comprehensive.</p> <p>Appropriate</p> <p>The manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>References are sufficient but need to add some more recent ones.</p> <p>1. Findings tables should be given. 2. Too many figures are not necessary.</p>	
<b>Minor REVISION</b> comments  1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Languages need to be improved—corrections given with red marks. Check for spelling mistakes.	
<b>Optional/General</b> 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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Tankeswar Gohain</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>School of Agricultural Sciences, Nagaland University, India</b>