

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_101003
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Foliar Application of Boron and Silicon on Growth and Yield of Maize (Zea mays L.)
Type of the Article	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>No</p> <p>Yes the title of the article is suitable.</p> <p>The significance of the work is not included in the abstract.</p> <p>The subsections and structure of the manuscript is not appropriate.</p> <p>The manuscript is not scientifically correct.</p> <p>The references are not sufficient.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The English language is poor.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>1) The significance of the work is not included in the abstract. 2) The introduction section is poor. 3) Materials and methods need to be in expanded form. 4) In results, the data has to be average of replicates + SD. 5) Discussion section is poorly written. 6) Conclusion needs to be elaborated. 7) English language is poor</p>	

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:	Aparna Gunjal
Department, University & Country	Dr. D. Y. Patil, Arts, Commerce & Science College, India