

Review Form1.7

JournalName:	InternationalJournalof Plant&SoilScience
ManuscriptNumber:	Ms_IJPSS_108631
TitleoftheManuscript:	“TostudyaboutfoliarapplicationofmicronutrientsonyieldattributesandyieldofBrinjal(SolanummelongenaL.)”
Typeofthe Article	

Review Form1.7

PART1: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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Isthe manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Isthe title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Isthe 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. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Yes, it is. 2. No, it's not. Isuggest: Assesment of foliar application of micronutrients on yield attributes and yield of Brinjal (Solanum melongena L.)". 3. Yes, it is. 4. Yes, it is. 5. There is a need to make some changes. 6. No, they are not. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 		
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>There are small suggestions and doubts, which are noted throughout the text.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Introduction: it is very extensive. There is no objective of the search. 2. Material and methods: The author did not describe what assessments were made. Nor what methodology was used. The author did not inform whether he made a comparison of means. Why didn't you put it in the results (Table)? 3. Results and Discussion: The author only reported the results, without any inference or corroboration of data. 4. References: There are few references and the author even cites an anonymous one. It is not recommended to cite anonymously in a scientific article, as it is not reliable. There must be some government (research) body that allows access to this information. 	

[Review Form1.7](#)

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Maria da Graça de Souza Lima
Department, University & Country	Brazil