

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_100309
Title of the Manuscript:	Influence of Sulphur and foliar application of Iron on Growth and Yield of Lentil (<i>Lens culinaris</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)
<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>I have read the paper Influence of Sulphur and foliar application of Iron on Growth and Yield of Lentil (<i>Lens culinaris</i> L.). The work is interesting and is appropriate for publication in the journal after performing a minor and careful revision.</p> <p>The abstract must be better organized to elaborate the scientific importance and soundness of this study, particularly to highlight the innovations in methodology and new findings of this study.</p> <p>I suggest the authors to remove generic lines and present the strong statements and novelty of article.</p> <p>Overall, the discussion part is weak. The Discussion should summarize the manuscript's main finding(s) in the context of the broader scientific literature and address any study limitations or results that conflict with other published work.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

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

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ilea Marioara
Department, University & Country	University of Agricultural Science and Veterinary Medicine, Romania