

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_104580
Title of the Manuscript:	Role of organic and inorganic bio-fertilizers in the growth and yield of Okra (<i>Abelmoschus esculentus</i> (L) Moench)
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"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. 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"> 1. The importance of the research results for this article lies in what is original: - the treatments used to increase the performance of the okra culture; - the location of the experimental field, for which sufficient identification data is not given. The importance of the results presented in the article is conditioned by the existence of some technical elements that demonstrate the real performance of the experiments in the field: sketch with the dimensions of the plots, photos of the plots with different treatments in which the differences are visible, technical elements about the way of harvesting and observing the characteristics the final of cultures. 2. Yes, the title of the article is suitable. 3. Yes, the abstract is comprehensive, but a lot of information that is given in the Material and Methods chapter does not need to be specified in the abstract. In addition, the abstract has some shortcomings, comparing with the requests of the journal template: aims, study design, conclusion. It is recommended to rewrite the abstract in accordance with the requirements of the journal template. 4. In general, the article includes all the components of the structure indicated in the journal template. The article does not include a Conclusions chapter. 5. The general structure of the article is in accordance with the template of the journal, except for the fact that it does not include a chapter of conclusions, which is otherwise not required by the template. However, by chapters and as a whole, the article presents deficiencies that must be remedied: 5.1 Much information in the article is redundant. For example, the structure of the treatments is detailed both in the Abstract and in the Material and Methods chapter. I think that in the Abstract it is not necessary to detail the structure of the treatments. 5.2 Specifying the treatments for each citation has an intensely redundant character. In my opinion, detailing the structure of the treatments would be sufficient in Table 2, in the rest of the article the treatments are only identified T1, T2, etc. In the treatment definition chapter (Materials and Methods), reference can be made to Table 2 for the treatment structure. 5.3 Field experiments are incompletely defined and described. The location is not specified by geographic coordinates or GIS maps (I gave an example in Fig. 1 added by the reviewer, which is obtained on the free version of Google Earth) or other types of maps. There is no scheme for the layout of the experimental plots in the experimental field (possible 18x3=54 plots?). The dimensions of the plots are not given. In an era where almost every one of us has a mobile phone in our pocket, weren't photos taken as evidence of the experiments (we could have seen the parallel evolution over time of the plants with different treatments)? There are no descriptions for the observation and calculation procedures for the performed parameters of the culture. Nothing about the climatic conditions, and their relation to the minimum and average requirements of the okra culture. Without these details, the publication of the article is risky because the publisher can be accused of not knowing some basic experimental elements. 5.4 If the redundant elements are removed, the abstract remains very reduced, and the body of the text is also reduced. There is thus room for the graphic representation of other parameters, as in the unnumbered figure before the References. 5.5 The forms are often laconic and clumsy, so the text must be reformulated at an academic level. 5.6 There are possibilities to improve the quality of the statistics by developing rules that take into account all the parameters of the okra culture, possibly with weights and with the help of which the farmers can obtain the most convenient rankings of the treatments used in 	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>the experiments.</p> <p>6. References are not listed and cited in the article as required in the journal template. The list of references must be redone by numbering the included works, and the citations rewritten in the text with the number in square brackets. The number of references should be increased to at least 15, taking into account the large amount of literature dedicated to okra boxes. A comparison in terms of common performance parameters for the experimental results presented in various articles could be made in this way.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The English language must be controlled at least with the text editor, but it is preferable to also use the programs Grammarly or QuillBot, free or higher versions.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The raw scientific content exists, but, without evidence, any student can invent the data in Table 2, taking inspiration only from data published in other articles. For details, see the reviewed manuscript, attached to the review.</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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Cardei Petru
Department, University & Country	The National Institute of Research – Development for Machines and Installations Designed for Agriculture and Food Industry, Romania