

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_101200
Title of the Manuscript:	Influence of NPK Levels in Conjugation with FYM on Soil Health properties and Yield of Maize (Zea mays 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><u>Compulsory REVISION comments</u></p> <p>1. <u>Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</u></p> <p>2. <u>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</u></p> <p>3. <u>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</u></p> <p>4. <u>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</u></p> <p>5. <u>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</u></p> <p>6. <u>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</u></p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p><u>The manuscript is very important for the scientific community and offers interesting ideas for research.</u></p> <p><u>The title of the article is apt and very effective</u></p> <p><u>The abstract of the article is exhaustive and ensures that the reader immediately understands the investigation.</u></p> <p><u>The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate and complete at all points.</u></p> <p><u>The manuscript is scientifically correct</u></p> <p><u>The references are sufficient and recent but I would still improve them to ensure that scholars can better study the paper examined.</u></p>	
<p><u>Minor REVISION comments</u></p> <p>1. <u>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</u></p>	<p><u>The quality of the English language of the article is suitable for academic communication, it is fluent and correct</u></p>	
<p><u>Optional/General comments</u></p>	<p><u>The work is clear, very interesting. The reading is very smooth and this guarantees a good understanding.</u></p>	

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>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Carmine Boniello
Department, University & Country	University of Salerno, Italy