

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_104626
Title of the Manuscript:	Agronomic Evaluation of Nitrogen and Boron on Growth and Yield of Baby Corn (Zea mays 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>)

Review Form 1.7

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>Yes,</p> <p>Yes, the title is inclusive.</p> <p>The abstract is not informative about the theme of this research study.</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>Yes, but it needs some serious revisions in its contents.</p> <p>The references are not enough to support the article. Additional references are required to be added in introduction and discussion,</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language is OK.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>1. The abstract is not informative about the theme of this research study. It needs to be rewritten to provide complete information of the study; aims, methodology, findings and conclusion in a summarized way.</p> <p>2. Consistent with the abstract, the introduction lacks the basic structure, and the requisite information. It should be re written in a concise way to introduce the previous literature on the subject, proper paragraphing, and describe the research objective. It also lacks enough references to support the introduction. Incorporate more references.</p> <p>3. The M&M section only describe the study location in details, while lacks basic information. The pre-experiment soil analysis for B and N, whether the experiment was conducted in pots or field etc. Also, the details of measurement of agronomic traits etc is missing.</p> <p>4. The results section is combined with discussion; however, I didn't find any discussion. Apart, the statistical analysis and comparison of different treatment have no significant effect on the agronomic traits especially in the yield traits. Can you explain? Revisit your data and analysis.</p> <p>5. The conclusion is wrong, kindly rewrite it after revising the manuscript.</p>	

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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</p>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ahmad Ali
Department, University & Country	College of Plant Science & Technology, Huazhong Agricultural University, China