

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_95463
Title of the Manuscript:	Potassium management for improving grain yield in mash bean
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> <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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>I consider that the theme is very important both for the research, as well as for normal person, who are going to benefit by the fact that more food is obtained.</p> <p>The title is well chosen, but it still needs to be completed by mentioning the research location "... - results from".</p> <p>I consider it comprehensive, even if it needs some corrections, as well as the entire paper. The same request here – mention the research area.</p> <p>Yes, they are appropriate, but not well marked – it's difficult to identify where a subsection ends and a new one begins. Please add at least one free row between them.</p> <p>Yes, I can say the research work was well performed, so that the data are accurate.</p> <p>There are enough cited papers, but not all of them are mentioned in the text. I identified missing Alam et al., 2011; Chaudhary et al., 2018; Islam and Muttaleb, 2016. Please use the citations as I wrote them above – you are missing punctuation marks, which make them look strange and it's not correct.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Even if English is quite all right, the entire paper needs some revision – there are wrong words, missing or additional spaces. Please explain what is RDF. In Abstract you wrote "100gm seed weight"... please explain or correct. Also, use this version "12.5 kg K₂O ha⁻¹" instead of "50kg K₂O ha⁻¹". Refer to figures and tables using the same format – Figure 1, Table 1 and so on. Figure 1 is cropped; I think something is missing in the right part. Tables needs a head row, maybe use bold characters.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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:	Horoias Roxana
Department, University & Country	University of Agronomic Sciences and Veterinary Medicine of Bucharest, Romania