

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_104652
Title of the Manuscript:	Impact of controlling treatment on African marigold (Tagetes erecta L.) with special reference to Economic parameters
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>)

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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Yes, the manuscript is important for the scientific community as it provides valuable insights into the impact of Integrated Nutrient Management (INM) on the growth and economic parameters of African marigold (<i>Tagetes erecta</i> L.). The study demonstrates the effectiveness of different treatments, including combinations of fertilizers, vermicompost, and bioinoculants, in enhancing flower yields and overall economic returns in marigold cultivation. The findings contribute to the knowledge base of sustainable and economically viable practices in flower production, making the manuscript relevant and valuable to researchers, horticulturists, and farmers alike. Alternative title: "Enhancing Economic Parameters in African Marigold (<i>Tagetes erecta</i> L.) through Integrated Nutrient Management" Clear Objective: The abstract should explicitly state the main objective or research question of the study to provide a clearer focus for the readers. Methodological Details: Including a brief description of the experimental design and sample size would enhance the abstract's comprehensiveness. Conclusions: A concluding sentence summarizing the main findings and their significance would add a sense of closure to the abstract. Based on the information provided in the manuscript, it appears that the subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate and well-organized. The manuscript follows a standard scientific format with distinct sections such as Introduction, Materials and Methods, Results and Discussion, and References. Additionally, within the Results and Discussion section, subsections are used to present and discuss different aspects of the research findings, such as Flower Yields, Gross Realization, Total Cost of Cultivation, and Cost-Benefit Ratio. The clear division of content into subsections helps readers to navigate the manuscript easily and understand the logical flow of information. The structure provides a coherent presentation of the research process and outcomes. Overall, the manuscript demonstrates a well-structured and organized approach to presenting the study's findings and discussion. Based on the information provided in the manuscript, it appears to be scientifically correct. The study design, methodology, and data analysis follow standard scientific practices. The results are presented clearly, and the conclusions drawn are supported by the data presented. However, a comprehensive review by experts in the field would be necessary to ensure the scientific accuracy and validity of the study. The references provided in the manuscript are sufficient, but there is room for improvement in terms of including more recent sources. While the references cover relevant literature, incorporating more recent research papers and studies published in the last few years can enhance the manuscript's credibility and reflect the latest developments in the field. Adding recent references will ensure that the study is up- 	

Review Form 1.7

	to-date with the current state of research.	
Minor REVISION comments		
1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	<p>1. Based on the text provided in the manuscript and the conversation, the language and English quality appear to be suitable for scholarly communications. The language used is clear, concise, and technically sound, which is essential for effective scientific communication.</p> <p>However, it is worth noting that the quality of language and writing can be further improved through careful proofreading and editing. It is always beneficial to have the manuscript reviewed by a language editor or a colleague proficient in English to ensure clarity, coherence, and adherence to scholarly writing conventions.</p> <p>Overall, the language quality of the manuscript seems appropriate for scholarly communications, but fine-tuning through editing can enhance its overall readability and professional presentation.</p>	
Optional/General comments	The manuscript is well-written with proper sentence structure, grammar, and vocabulary. The author effectively conveys the research findings and their implications. However, as with any scholarly article, there is always room for improvement in language and writing. To ensure a high standard of English in the manuscript, it is advisable to have it thoroughly reviewed by a language editor or a native English speaker with expertise in scientific writing. This additional step will help address any potential minor language issues and ensure the manuscript meets the standards of scholarly communication.	

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:	Lusi Herawati Suryaningrum
Department, University & Country	Indonesia