

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_99539
Title of the Manuscript:	INFLUENCE OF VARIOUS ORGANIC AMENDMENTS ON GROWTH AND YIELD ATTRIBUTES OF MUNG BEAN (<i>Vigna radiata</i> 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)
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)	<p>The manuscript is well articulated and described. However, it lacks some fundamental parameters and evaluations to do a good scientific evaluation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The characteristics of the soil are not reported which, on the basis of the results exposed, seems to be very poor in nutrients and organic matter. - The composition and amount of RDF is not specified, nor on which parameters it was decided and in what way has been provided. - Similarly, for other organic treatments. <p>Finally, some images of the experimental plots would have been useful for better focusing the site and the test.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>NO</p> <p>Yes</p>	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	It's easily understood, but I'm not qualified to judge the quality of the English language	
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:	Pietro Toscano
Department, University & Country	Research Centre for Engineering and Agri-Food Processing, Italy