

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_98876
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of phosphorus and boron on growth, yield and economics of green gram (Vigna radiata 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)	Good approach in assessing the effectiveness of nutrient supply to improve plant production No comment Concise and understandable No comment Good work Appropriate recent references	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	The author should pay attention: 1- on spelling and grammars 2- On repetitive words (in the abstract: ... in treatment in treatment 9 ...) Also, the conclusion is oversimplified and needs to be strengthened to make it more robust	

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:	Hantanirina Herisoa Isabelle
Department, University & Country	Université Antananarivo, Madagascar