

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_104044
Title of the Manuscript:	Growth and yield of urdbean [Vigna mungo (L.) Hepper] influenced by vermicompost and vermiwash
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?	1. YES. The article has an interesting theme, as it refers to the organic fertilization of a pulse species, whose scientific information is still incipient.	
2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	2. YES.	
3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?	3. PARTIALLY. See comments in the manuscript text itself.	
4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	4. YES.	
5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?	5. NO. The methodology presents mistakes regarding the statistical analyses. And this can interfere with the interpretation of the data obtained. See comments in the manuscript text itself.	
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)	6. YES.	

Review Form 1.7

Minor REVISION comments		
1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	YES	
Optional/General 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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Cândido Alves Da Costa
Department, University & Country	Universidade Federal De Minas Gerais, Brazil