

Review Form 1.7

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name: | International Journal of Plant & Soil Science |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_IJPSS_101243 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Effect of various organic manure sources on the performance of Valeriana jatamansi in Hill Zone of West Bengal |
| Type of the 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>)

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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 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> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Importance: They conducted a set of experiments at Hill Zone of West Bengal, Kalimpong during 2017-20 to standardize organic nutrient management in <i>V. jatamansi</i> for optimum growth and economic yield. Title: Long and preferred to be modified into "Performance of <i>Valeriana jatamansi</i> in Hill Zone of West Bengal Concerning Manure Sources". Abstract: Clear to a certain extent. Many modifications were suggested to enhance the readability and understanding of the text. Structure of the manuscript: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Keywords: Re-arrange in alphabetical order as suggested. Introduction: Improperly arranged into four paragraphs. The introduction has to be rearranged into three paragraphs only i.e. 1. Introduction 2. Significance of the study, and 3. Aim of the study. Many modifications were suggested to enhance the readability and understanding of the text. The aim: Not listed. The authors have to list the aim of the study by the end of the introduction section as suggested. Materials and methods: Please notice the following: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Provide the institutional ethical approval for the study. Many abbreviations were used without adding their full names at the first appearance (highlighted in yellow). Define the total number of samples collected from the soil plot after harvesting. Identify the model and manufacturer of the Systronics pH meter. Provide details on the statistical analysis, the software used, the statistical model, and a reference. Many modifications were suggested to enhance the readability and understanding of the text. Results: Novel and clear to a certain extent. Reduce the illustration of the numerical value in the text and instead describe your results. Do not list the details of the treatment all over to avoid redundancy. Add the P-value to the significant results in the text. Many modifications were suggested to enhance the readability and understanding of the text. Discussion: No discussion was recorded to compare the current results with the previous studies. Conclusion: Clear. Some modifications were suggested to enhance the readability and understanding of the text. Tables: Well-presented and organized. Figures: Well-presented and organized. Scientific Soundness: The manuscript carried a novel idea. References: MUST BE UPDATED as 7.1% (1 out of 14) of the listed references were published in the past five years. The percentage has to increase to at least 30-40%. The lack of updated references indicated a study of lower interest. | |
| <p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | <p>General view: The manuscript was expressed in moderate English and grammar. Professional copyediting and proofreading, adding discussion of the obtained results, and references update have to be carried out before resubmission to achieve publishing value.</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: | Essam Samir Soliman |
| Department, University & Country | Suez Canal University, Egypt |