

Review Form 1.7

Journal name:	International Journal of Plant and Soil Sciences
Manuscript number:	Mrs_IJPSS_102046
Manuscript Title:	Response of inorganic fertilizers, wheat and rhizobia residues on soil health and yield attributes of green gram (<i>Vigna radiata</i> L.) var. samrat
Item Type	Original Research Article

General guideline for the peer review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that NO manuscript should be rejected solely on the basis of "lack of novelty", as long as the manuscript is scientifically sound and technically sound. For the complete guide to the 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 comment	Author comment (if you agree with the reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. Authors are required to write their comments here)
<p><u>Mandatory</u> REVIEW Feedback</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important to the scientific community? (Please write a few sentences in this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article appropriate? (If not, please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article complete?</p> <p>4. Are the 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 any suggestions for additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Other than the 6 points mentioned above, reviewers can provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. The writing regarding scientific interest presents: The words must be worked with the UNESCO THESAURUS, which is a universal glossary that allows the location of the writing and its development: Agriculture, Cultivation, Soils... The problem is presented in a detailed way, revealing its importance to be treated; In addition, it is justified with emphasis on studies carried out on soils. The context of the investigation highlights the importance of the soil and the influence of rain on the soils to be experimented is meticulously detailed; the randomized plot design is appropriate in this type of study; Several formulas are determined for the interpretation of results. The results are described in a broad way, new contributions to soil treatments can be appreciated. There is no discussion in the work, that is, the reason for the originality of this study is not indicated. The conclusion responds to the stated objective of the investigation. Since it does not exist, it cannot be evaluated.</p> <p>2. The subject is appropriate for research and contribution to the agricultural system, apparently the study is unique for the proposed area and from this aspect its originality can be indicated.</p> <p>3. It is necessary to increase the objective of the investigation and the main conclusions reached: the methodology and the results are appreciable.</p> <p>4. The structure of the article is appropriate.</p> <p>5. It has some weaknesses that must be strengthened and corrected.</p> <p>6. The references are fine, however, it would be important to expand to 30-40 references. This always supports new findings.</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVIEW Feedback</p> <p>1. Is the quality of the language/English of the article adequate for scholarly communications?</p>	Appreciable	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Jeverson Santiago Quishpe Gaibor
Department, University & Country	Salesian Polytechnic University, Ecuador