

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Plant &amp; Soil Science</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJPSS_105198</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Mode of application of Zn and Mn on growth and yield of Garden pea (<i>Pisum sativum</i> var. <i>hortense</i> L.)</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### 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)
<b>Compulsory REVISION</b> comments  <b>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)  <b>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)  <b>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b>  <b>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>  <b>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b>  <b>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b>  <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b>	The results and discussion are relevant to the advancement of knowledge.  The title correlates with the objectives, results and conclusions.  The summary of the article is complete and conforms to what was developed in the present work. The subsections are appropriate and the structure of the manuscript is adequate. The manuscript is scientifically correct, which suggests its publication.  The bibliography is adequate and updated with the subject matter.	
<b>Minor REVISION</b> comments  <b>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	The quality of the language/English of the article is adequate for scholarly communications. it is very well written	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	In order to improve the presentation of the work carried out, suggestions for corrections are included in the manuscript.	

### 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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details) There are no ethical issues in this paper	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Maritza Vacca Molina</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>National University of Salta, Argentina</b>