

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Plant &amp; Soil Science</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJPSS_110964</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Effect of Bio-NPK and organic manures on growth, yield and economics of cauliflower (Brassica oleracea var. botrytis L.) var. Pusa Snowball K 1”</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The topic of evaluating biofertilizers and organic nutrient sources for cauliflower production is important and valuable for the scientific community. However, the introduction lacks detail on the novelty and significance of this specific work.</li> <li>2. Yes, title of the article is suitable.</li> <li>3. The abstract provides a good overview of the study but does not highlight the importance and implications of the findings.</li> <li>4. The structure of the introduction, methods, results, and discussion sections is logically organized.</li> <li>5. The study design and much of the analysis seems scientifically sound</li> <li>6. More references providing background on the specific bio-NPK product and recent literature on cauliflower response to organic amendments should be added to support the rationale, methodology, and discussion. The references are generally relevant but more context is needed.</li> </ol> <p><b><u>Additional suggestions/comments</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The introduction could provide some more background on why biofertilizers and organic manures are important nutrient management strategies and what gaps exist that this study is aiming to address. What specifically is novel about this work?</li> <li>• The materials and methods should provide more details on the bio-NPK product used - composition, microorganisms present, etc. This will allow better interpretation and reproducibility.</li> <li>• The statistical analysis methodology is not described very clearly. More specifics are needed on the software/tests used, variables analyzed, and results presentation. Were any corrections for multiple testing applied?</li> <li>• The results presentation, while generally clear, is very text-heavy. Using more tables and figures to showcase key data could enhance readability and impact.</li> <li>• Figures would help visualize growth trends over time. It's better to split figure 1 in two figures that will enhance the visual/readability of the figure. Make one figure for plant height and other for number of leaves.</li> <li>• The discussion tends to restate many results rather than interpret mechanisms, significance, implications etc. More effort could be made to contextualize specific findings in relation to past literature and theory.</li> <li>• The conclusion emphasizes recommendations for farmers, however no real economic analysis is presented to support this. Showing yield benefits alongside costs would strengthen these management recommendations.</li> <li>• Carefully proofread wording, grammar, punctuation etc. There are instances of awkward phrasing that should be smoothed out. Define all abbreviations upon first use.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The language and scholarly style of communication is reasonable but revisions for clarity, grammar, and wording are needed throughout. Terminology should also be made more consistent.</li> </ol>	

**Review Form 1.7**

<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The visual presentation of results requires substantial improvement through tables/figures for main effects and interactions.  More explanation is needed for the theories proposed to explain the yield and growth results obtained.  This manuscript is very good overall and can likely be accepted as is, pending only minor revisions. The topic is relevant, methods are sound, analysis is appropriate, and the paper contributes useful findings. I recommend acceptance once the authors address any minor comments.	
----------------------------------	---	--

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Muhammad Ahmad</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Agriculture, Pakistan</b>