

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_97447
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Zinc and Foliar Application of Silicon on growth 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>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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. The manuscript is good for scientific community if all the corrections observed in it could be properly effected</p> <p>2. The state and or region and if possible the country in which the research was carried out should be captured in the title. Very important.</p> <p>3. The abstract is too far from being comprehensive.</p> <p>The following points have been noted concerning the shallowness of the abstract</p> <p>A. The abstract is too shallow, bringing in things that are not relevant leaving the relevant aspect of the study.</p> <p>B. The results were merely enumerated without indicating their significance to the study</p> <p>C. The abstract is inconclusive because of the following:</p> <p>D. No indication of contribution to scientific knowledge</p> <p>E. No suggestions and or recommendation to the farmers as regards the applicability of the above method for a better crop yield.</p> <p>F. The abstract is supposed to be an overview of the entire research, but reverse is the case</p> <p>G. The abstract needs to be completely recast to capture the above suggestions.</p> <p>4. The subsections are not appropriate, especially the methodology and the discussion. many things were skipped which were highlighted in the manuscript.</p> <p>5. The manuscript is scientifically correct, only that it is shrouded with a lot of inconsistencies that needs to be corrected.</p> <p>6. The references are not enough and there is need to incorporate more current references because the most recent in the manuscript is 2018, that's about five years ago.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	The quality of English is not too bad and it is relatively suitable for scholarly communications.	
Optional/General comments	Other comments can be seen as indicated in the reviewed manuscript.	

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

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Okereke Chukwu Nkumah
Department, University & Country	Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Nigeria