

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_101252
Title of the Manuscript:	Response of Bio-organics on Soil Fertility Status, Growth and Yield Parameters of Black Gram(Vigna mungo) var. Shekar 2
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> <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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Is the manuscript important for scientific community? It is very important to the scientific world as well as farming communities because prices of fertilizers are skyrocketing.</p> <p>Is the title of the article suitable? The title of the article is suitable though slightly changed</p> <p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? The abstract of the article has been made to be comprehensive but author (s) need to adhere to the changes effected.</p> <p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate but must include a paragraph on both vermicompost and neem cake to support the objective.</p> <p>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? The manuscript is scientifically correct because of its nature and references cited and listed but the views of the author are not coming out. The references are not properly utilized because I expected the author(s) to relate his/her/their findings with other scientists. Nothing of this sort is mentioned throughout the entire manuscript.</p> <p>The data need to be scientifically analyzed to clearly show probability values and the mean values. It is not necessary to present the same information using figures and tables. I would suggest all the figures to be removed.</p> <p>It would be fine to use references within ten years backward except for for the originals.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Yes	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>This is an important manuscript but the author(s) need to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Include references cited but not listed as well as cite in the manuscript those that are listed. Deliberately all references have been rearranged in alphabetical order. ▪ Once again remove out all the figures 	

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

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Felix Mereka Chipojola
Department, University & Country	Malawi