

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_101929
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Durvillaea potatorum and Ascophyllum nodosum seaweed extracts on growth and yield of China aster cv. Arka Archana under Prayagraj agro climatic conditions
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 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. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	Yes. The manuscript is very important for scientific community. I would say, "Effects od selected seaweed extracts on..." rather than mentioning them by names. Yes. But reciting the title here, or even in the methodology, is unnecessary. Yes. But readers would like to know what happened to the second seaweed species. As such, the author should discuss that too. I firmly believe that. No problem with references. Only that bolding the citations within the text is scary. Statistical analysis tools used should be made clear.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Language is perfect.	
Optional/General comments	As noted on the text with red font.	

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

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	GodSteven Peter Maro
Department, University & Country	Tanzania Coffee Research Institute, Tanzania