

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Plant &amp; Soil Science</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJPSS_103767</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Effect of Biofertilizers on Growth and Yield of Field pea (Pisum Sativum) Varieties</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

	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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments  1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)  2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)  3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b>  4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>  5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b>  6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b>  <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	1. It is evident from the experiments that the application of Rachana, PSB, and Rhizobium sp. resulted in the highest growth attributes and seed yield in field pea crops. These findings suggest that a combination of these three components could be an effective approach for improving pea yield and overall plant health. Further research is needed to confirm these results and to determine the optimal dosage and timing of application for maximum benefit. Nonetheless, these promising results are a step towards improving pea production and contributing to food security.  2. The title is appropriate.  3. The abstract is comprehensive.  4. Yes  5. Yes  6. The references are sufficient and recent.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Yes. Corrections to several grammatical mistakes need to be completed.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Relevant and important research.	

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

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Raghunath Chandranauth</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>National Agricultural Research and Extension Institute, University of Guyana, Guyana School of Agriculture, Guyana</b>