

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_104272
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Organic Manures and Foliar Application of Zinc on Growth and Yield of Field pea (Pisum Sativum)
Type of the 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) Foliar application provide the direct nutrient to the plants through leaves. Zinc and organic manure are essential micronutrients for crop nutrition and its helps to provides the various physiological role to the plants for stress tolerance, growth yield, protein and auxin synthesis, carbohydrate metabolism, pollen formation and maintainace of cellular membrane</p> <p>2) Effect of Zinc Foliar Application and Organic Manures on Growth and Yield of Field Pea (<i>Pisum Sativum</i> L.)</p> <p>3) Abstract of the article not much compnhensive and having some hanging statement</p> <p>4) The use of good approaches did not entirely eliminate all the problems.</p> <p>5) It is correct but there is no showed the relationship between attributes/no graphical representation</p> <p>6) References are sufficient, but more may be included.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Except for minor punctuation issues and a few dangling lines</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Subsections are interconnected.</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><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mukesh Kumar
Department, University & Country	Maharishi Dayanand University, India