

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_102762
Title of the Manuscript:	Response of Bio-organics on Soil Fertility Status and Morphological Parameters of Green Gram(Vigna radiata L.) (var. PDM 139)
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"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. 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"> 1. Yes the manuscript is important for the scientific community. There is a lot of literature on this issue. The location of the experiments and the recipes used are original to the authors of this work. Although the variants used are simple and not many, the work is a beginning and a case for the formation of selective databases for the local problem of improving soil properties. 2. Yes, the title of the article is suitable. 3. Yes the abstract of the article is comprehensive. 4. The subsection and structure of the manuscript are appropriate. 5. The manuscript is scientifically correct. From a scientific point of view, there are the following observations: 5.1) There is no visual evidence of the experiments: photos, maps, sketches showing the location of the experiment, the plots, the dimensions of the plots, the preventive measures of the interaction between the variants, aspects of the plants in the final phase, when harvesting for various treatment variants; 5.2) It is not specified if rehearsals were made; The biggest problem with the article is the very poor quality writing: 5.3) The coordinates of the location of the experimental field are given in a wrong form (see the reviewed manuscript); 5.4) Deficient or not allowed expressions in a scientific Journal language (not allowed abbreviations, unfinished sentences, stuck words, unexplained abbreviations), wrong writing of some units; 5.4) One of the most serious problems from a scientific point of view is the listing and citation in the text of the literature: in the list of references there are many works not cited in the text and in the text there are citations that do not appear in the list of references. This situation makes a rigorous control of the article impossible. 6. The references are sufficient and recent. The majority of references are NOT cited in the text of the manuscript. Also, it seems that there are citations in the text of the manuscript that were not included in the reference list. I indicated these observations on the text of the reviewed manuscript. The list of references and citations are not in accordance with the authors' guide (https://journalijpss.com/index.php/IJPSS/about/submissions). 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>A serious language check is recommended after the editor specifies which version of the English language is accepted (UK, US, India, other). The control must be done with the text editor, but also with other programs, for example Grammarly (free or the superior version) but also QuillBot, which also gives suggestions for changing the phrases.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Due to the deficiencies indicated in 1., 5. and 6., the decision is to publish the article (from a strictly scientific point of view, the work is correct, expression is deficient) after a major revision</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:	Cardei Petru
Department, University & Country	The National Institute of Research Development for Machines and Installations Designed for Agriculture and Food Industry, Romania