

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Journal of Plant &amp; Soil Science</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_98169
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Foliar Humic Acids on Water Productivity, Biochemical Parameters and Biotic Stress on Geranium Yield
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://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><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>1. <b>Yes, the topic is important and interesting</b></p> <p>2. <b>Yes, the title is good</b></p> <p>3. <b>Yes, the abstract is comprehensive but should be more clear and concise. Some sentences are hard to follow.</b></p> <p>4. <b>Yes, the structure is appropriate. However with some suggestions ( see explanation below the 6<sup>th</sup>)</b></p> <p>5. <b>Yes, the manuscript is good but with some suggestions.</b></p> <p>6. <b>Yes, the references are good enough.</b></p> <p><b>Additional suggestions/ comments :</b></p> <p>1. The sentences explaining [ 22] &amp; [23] should be edited to make it more clear.</p> <p>2. In method there was using (ANOVA) with Tukey's test (<math>p &lt; 0.05</math>) however it not clearly put in the results and discussion.</p> <p>3. There are too many tables and lack of figures and graphs. It is suggested to explain some of the results with figure/graphs.</p> <p>4. The fundamental note of Water productivity in the section 2.3.4.3 and Table 8. The unit of WP should be kg/lt or kg/m<sup>3</sup> instead of kg/ha that is a land productivity unit.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	Yes, but some sentences should be more clear and concise	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	Overall the manuscript is good but need some rewriting, adding the statistical analysis results, adding with some graphs and please adjusted the Water productivity unit.	

[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>Jonathan E. Koehuan</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>The Artha Wacana Christian University, Indonesia</b>