

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Plant &amp; Soil Science</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJPSS_109839</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Effect of Inorganic Nutrients and Biofertilizers on Growth, Yield and Soil Properties of Maize (Zea mays L.) in N-W Region of Punjab</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### 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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>1. Presenting the results of this research can show some scientific facts about the effect of the use of biological fertilizers with common bacterial agents on growth and yield of Maize and Pysico-chemical properties of soil.</p> <p>2. Yes, the title is acceptable.</p> <p>3. All treatments are mentioned in the abstract, but their results on corn yield and soil properties are not quantitatively presented.</p> <p>4. The subsections and structure of the manuscript can be acceptable after edition</p> <p>5. The manuscript is scientifically correct but data analysis is not acceptable and comparison of averages of the data and their significance is not provided in Tables.</p> <p>6. The references of the manuscript are sufficient and recent.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>1. Yes.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>The manuscript has a practical topic and the experiments have been designed and implemented in a scientific way. The data analysis is correct, but in the results) Tables), the comparison of averages is not presented and should be added. Despite providing detailed information about the Geographically the experimental site of research was carried out, information about the source of Azotobacter and Azospirillum strains used was not provided. If the commercial biofertilizer used or the microbes used in this research have accession numbers in microbial data bases, it is necessary to provide strain information and accession numbers in the manuscript. In the entire manuscript, the significance level of comparison of averages is not provided (1% or 5%) and at the end of the manuscript, future suggestions and conclusions are not provided.</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><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Samira Shahbazi</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Nuclear Science and Technology Research Institute, Iran</b>