

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_97656
Title of the Manuscript:	Response of Brinjal (Solanum melongena L.) to bio-stimulants in relation to growth, yield and Quality
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>)

Review Form 1.7

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>1. The article is an original research work on the <i>Response of Brinjal (Solanum melongena L.) to bio-stimulants in relation to growth, yield and Quality</i>. It contributes to an important aspect of agricultural sciences. Overall, it is a good article and may be accepted after the suggested changes have been implemented.</p> <p>2. The title of the article is suitable.</p> <p>3. The ending of the abstract may be done with a one-line conclusion.</p> <p>4. The subsections of the manuscript are appropriate.</p> <p>5. The manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>6. The references are insufficient and not recent. A few more recent references should be included. Also, the following references in the reference section have not been mentioned in the main text of the article. The author(s) should mention these references appropriately in the article:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Joshi, N. C, Singh DK. 2001. Effect of plant bioregulators on chilli. Vegetable Science. 28(1). • Natesh, N., Vyakaranahal B S, Shekharagouda M and Deshpande VK. 2005. Effect of micronutrients and organics on growth, yield and quality of chilli. Karnataka J. Agric. Sci., 18(2): 334-337. <p>Additional comments:</p> <p>i. The keywords are traditionally written in alphabetical order separated by semicolons.</p> <p>ii. In the Materials and Methods section, the Longitudes and Latitudes be mentioned for a reader not versed with the name of the location.</p> <p>iii. The author(s) should plot a few graphs to show the trends in the results like plant height, fruit weight, etc. in a better visual way.</p> <p>iv. The author(s) should include a few photographs of the soil samples, bio-stimulants used, Brinjal yield, and study site for better understanding of the research.</p> <p>v. The author(s) should add a "future scope of study" section after the conclusion section, describing in brief how this current research can help in future research and agricultural policies.</p> <p>vi. There are minor formatting issues in the article. Some of them have been highlighted by the reviewer for the author(s) to rectify.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	The language/English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications.	
Optional/General comments		

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Avdesh Bhardawaj
Department, University & Country	India