

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_103659
Title of the Manuscript:	Response of boron and molybdenum on growth and yield of black gram (Vigna mungo L.)
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>)

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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The manuscript is important for scientific community. (Both trace element are important for crop growth and nicely explained.) 2. The article is suitable. 3. The abstract of the article is comprehensive. Aim and importance of studied element is missing. The results values need to be recheck from the tables. 4. The manuscript is scientifically correct. 5. The references are sufficient and recent. However required uniformity. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments) The additional suggestions/comments provided on the right side of the original manuscript. Minor changes are required.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Table 1-2 information is missing in results and discussion. 2. Aim of study in introduction / abstract part is missing. 3. The results data needs to be recheck within results and abstract portion. 4. Uniformity in reference for names of author is required. 5. Use italic font for name of plant species. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	suitable	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	The MS may be acceptable after minor revision.	

[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:	Muhammad Shafiq
Department, University & Country	University of Karachi, Pakistan