

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_100124
Title of the Manuscript:	Response of Integrated Nutrients on Soil Health and Yield Attributes of Cluster bean (<i>Cyamopsis tetragonoloba</i> L.) cv. Neelam
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> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>Response of Integrated Nutrients on Soil Health and Yield of Cluster bean (<i>Cyamopsis tetragonoloba</i> L.)</p> <p>Yes but over saturated with information and data. Abstract should be a summary of the research. Abstract should be between 200 – 250 and some cases 300. Minimise the use of data in abstract. Abstract should be captivating not oversaturated with information</p> <p>The flow from introduction is not appropriate. There is poor flow</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p>	<p>The manuscript was design to enhance soil health and the yield of Cluster bean (<i>Cyamopsis tetragonoloba</i> L.) using integrated nutrient as a mean of stimulating plant growth and yield. The nutrient used were replicated to study the effect of nutrient introduced ha⁻¹. The result was favourable but the flow in the manuscript is not sufficient for publication. However, I suggest revision on the manuscript.</p>
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>From introduction to conclusion should be reframe. There is no flow of information</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</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:	Alabi Olusoji David
Department, University & Country	Durban University of Technology, South Africa