

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_94963
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECT OF ORGANIC MANURE AND INORGANIC FERTILIZER ON GROWTH YEILD AND QUALITY OF ONION (<i>Alliumcepa</i> L.)
Type of the Article	Original Research 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>)

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>	<p>This work's underlying premise is sound; however, the introductory and experimental sections, which are poorly explained and use the oldest references, are presented. Additionally, their technique section is useless and deficient in information. By discussing significant subtopics, the authors were unable to adequately address the main question of the original study. Any distinctions were not existed between the conclusion part and the summary & conclusions section. Additionally, I'm baffled as to why the authors defined the title in the summary & conclusions section. The earliest references were also utilized in this manuscript to validate the authors' observations and points of view. The list of references is insufficient and out-of-date. There were numerous mistakes in the references section (which was disorganized).</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 		
<p>Optional/General comments</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><u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u></p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Shahira H. EL-Moslamy
Department, University & Country	Genetic Engineering and Biotechnology Research Institute, City of Scientific Research and Technological Applications, Egypt