

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_102925
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of zinc and boron on yield, quality and nutritional value of Broccoli head (<i>Brassica oleracea</i> var. <i>italica</i>) with different application methods in red and lateritic soils of Birbhum district.
Type of the Article	Original Research 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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>yes</p> <p>Compressive but the result section is too wordy</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>The references are not sufficient and are not recent. They should be adjusted and a recent ones added to further strengthen the result and discussion section</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>yes</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The manuscript is ok but the highlighted concerns needs to be addressed. The authors z</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why didn't you include treatment without any fertilizer applied as a negative control? • Was soil analysis done after treatments application to ensure application of these treatments had positive influence on the soil? • Can you Explain in your methodology how plant spread area is collected • And also indicate how you were able to collect every data for instance: How did you get data on head weight etc in detail • The author needs to indicate in the methodology the seasons the experiments was done • Remove the figures and have only the tables. Tables seems clear and easy to understand • When I look at the pooled data in most of the tables, I don't see any differences between the treatments. You can then not say a particular treatment is better since they are the same. Do multiple comparisons to be siure 	

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Oliver Okumu
Department, University & Country	Hamelmallo Agricultural College, Eritrea