

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Plant &amp; Soil Science</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJPSS_101181</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Influence of macro and micronutrients on the yield and quality attributes of cauliflower (<i>Brassica oleracea</i> var. <i>botrytis</i> L.) cv. "Pusa Sharad"</b>
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> )

### **PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>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)</b>
<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><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p><b>Micronutrient importance is projected in this study. If supplementation of micronutrients gives significantly higher yield even with 75% RDF, more studies are to be done as future line of work and it should be made part of fertilizer recommendation.</b></p> <p><b>If 'Pusa Sharad' is selected as a representative variety, its name can be removed from the title and can be included in abstract</b></p> <p><b>Yes</b></p> <p><b>Length of introduction portion can be reduced.</b></p> <p><b>Since the result was the outcome of repeated field experiments for two years, it should be valued</b> <b>Sufficient</b></p> <p><b>In the manuscript, tables are presented without indicating significant differences, but in result and discussion, statistical difference is mentioned. Make modifications in the table otherwise remove the word '<b>significantly</b>'. In addition, pooled data analysis will be good, since the experiment was for two years.</b></p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>Though the language communicates well, some modifications will improve it more</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>Refine areas highlighted in yellow colour. Provide expanded form of RDF in abstract Providing expanded forms of elements like Mo or B will be pleasing to the readers</p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Karthika V P</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Regional Agricultural Research Station, Kerala Agricultural University, India</b>