

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Plant &amp; Soil Science</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJPSS_101407</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Effect of different level of NPK Fertilizers, FYM and Vermicompost on Yield attributes of Okra (Abelmoschus Esculentus L.) var. Devika</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### **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> )

## Review Form 1.7

### 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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. There are several works on the subject published as student congress memoirs. Which indicates that it is not an innovative topic</p> <p>2. It is appropriate in relation to the content</p> <p>3. It is necessary to indicate numerical and statistical results. Results are indicated through adjectives such as major or significant impact.</p> <p>4. Little appropriate</p> <p>5. Lack of methodological and statistical support</p> <p>6. Appropriate, but preferably some more should be consulted</p> <p><b>In Methodology:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Indicate number of plants per treatment</li> <li>The techniques used in the measurement of response variables are not indicated</li> </ul> <p><b>In Results and discussion:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In Table 2 no statistical analysis is observed. Numerical data are shown, but not statistical. This is repeated in all the measured variables</li> </ul> <p><b>In Conclusion</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Write as an inference, as no analyzes were performed to verify this statement. Since there were no replicate treatments</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	Acceptable	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	Statistical analysis is essential to give reliability to its results.	

### 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>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Gabriela Medina Ramos
Department, University & Country	Polytechnic University of Guanajuato, México