

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_97136
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of liquid jeevamrutha on growth yield and quality of China aster (<i>Callistephus chinensis</i> [L.] Nees.)
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)	1. The manuscript is important for scientific community. In general, this article provides information about the benefits of liquid jeevamrutha and organic fertilizers in general on growth yield and quality of China Aster. 2. The title of the article is suitable. 3. The abstract of the article is comprehensive. 4. Subsections and the structure of the manuscript are appropriate. 5. I think the manuscript is scientifically correct. 6. The references are not sufficient and recent. The discussion is shallow.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Language/English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications.	
Optional/General comments	1. The observed parameters are not all mentioned in the method. 2. The INM and RPP applications are not explained.	

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ary Susatyo Nugroho
Department, University & Country	PGRI Semarang University, Indonesia