

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Plant &amp; Soil Science</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJPSS_96905</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>INFLUENCE OF SEASONS AND NUTRIENT INVIGORATION ON SEED QUALITY IN GREENGRAM</b>
Type of the 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments 1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b> 4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b> 5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b> 6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b> <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b>	<b>Yes, any research on food production is always welcome for the people of the world.</b>  <b>Yes</b>  <b>Abstract is not precise.</b>  <b>Yes</b>  <b>Yes</b>  <b>Ok</b>  <b>There are over 875 grammatical mistakes, passive voice, incomplete sentences, totally unacceptable.</b>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments 1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Average	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Please see the comments enclosed in the article explain the parameters in results and discussion. The abstract is very numeric rewrite. Conclusion always forms the significant portion of the article and must always include the whole article and it must be strong. Please rewrite.	

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

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Usha Chirala</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Andhra University, India</b>