

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_105398
Title of the Manuscript:	Effects of various micronutrient levels on the biochemical and organoleptic attributes of guava cv. 27
Type of the Article	

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
<p><u>Compulsory</u> 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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>It is important and the topic of the study has become global concern</p> <p>Suitable</p> <p>Abstract is not comprehensive</p> <p>The comments provided in each section separately.</p> <p>The comments provided in each section separately.</p> <p>The comments provided in each section separately</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>It needs some improvement.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>Abstract</p> <p>Abstract is not comprehensive. It did not specifically indicate the problem of the study. The study purpose was not clearly stated. I suggest the authors to revisit it. No conclusion statement provided in the abstract.</p> <p>Keywords: Reordering the words alphabetically is required.</p> <p>Introduction</p> <p>The introduction part magnifies too much the importance than the problem. It missed the general and specific problems why the study was required?</p> <p>The purpose and hypothesis of the study was not clearly stated. Authors are also expected to provide sufficient evidences and references to justify the study.</p> <p>Materials and methods</p> <p>Very general description of the methods used.</p> <p>Line 1 and 2: In my opinion, there is no need to include the title of study in this section. It would</p>	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>rather good to start with materials used in the study. The comments provided in the text.</p> <p>Authors did not sufficiently describe the materials and methods of the study. It is very important to write this section in detail and coherently for others to follow the procedures.</p> <p>The description of applied methods is not good and it may not be easy for the reader to understand the rigor of the applied scientific method.</p> <p>Authors did not explain the way data were collected and analyzed Authors should rewrite the methodology section.</p> <p>Results and discussion</p> <p>ANOVA is missing. In presented study both the significance level nor LSD values are not indicated. Comments provided in the text.</p> <p>The discussion of presented results is not well described. It indicates the literature on the same or different results but do not explains the phenomena or relationships.</p> <p>Authors haven't provided a detailed discussion based on the results</p> <p>The references used are not sufficient and recent. I suggest for the author to update the references and explain the phenomena.</p> <p>Two way table is required to see the interaction effect of micronutrient (Zinc and borax).</p> <p>Conclusions</p> <p>It is advisable to briefly summarize the major findings and draw the conclusion. Comments provided in the text.</p> <p>References</p> <p>It is very important that the authors review the Journal's guidelines. Please, check it.</p> <p>References are not sufficient. Comments were given in the text.</p>	
--	--	--

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Alemayehu Zemedu Lemma
Department, University & Country	Ethiopian Institute of Agricultural Research, Ethiopia