

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_99415
Title of the Manuscript:	Influence of sulphur and zinc on growth and yield of Black gram (Vigna mungo 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)	Yes, this manuscript deals with the effect of Zn as a minor element and S as a macro-anion element play a crucial role in plant metabolism, but the obtained data are insufficient to interpretation of work aim which is missed. Introduction includes some general knowledge. Results and discussion were deals with growth and yield arameters. Yes No No, the data illustration is absent No, the discussion with scientific comments is weak. No, few and need for additional recent references. Check on the references??? The references must be written in a uniform manner.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	No, language needs more correction and revision.	
Optional/General comments	Needs more attention and documented with scientific comments, particularly introduction, results, discussion and statistical analysis.	

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:	Kotb Amer Farghali
Department, University & Country	Assiut University, Egypt