

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_104734
Title of the Manuscript:	RESPONSE OF VERMICOMPOST AND PSB ON THE VEGETATIVE GROWTH AND YIELD OF ONION (<i>Allium cepa</i> L.)
Type of the 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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This manuscript has certain significance for the field of onion planting technology. It has certain guiding value for improving the yield of onion cultivation. But there are limitations to practical applications. 2. The title is more suitable for this article. 3. The abstract of the article is not comprehensive, the purpose, method and conclusion are not clear enough. 4. The subsections and structure of the manuscript are not appropriate. The content is relatively single. 5. The manuscript has no obvious scientific issues. 6. The cited references are few and outdated. Such as: Malunjkar B D , Verma A , Choudhary R , et al. Production of Fenugreek (<i>Trigonella foenum-graecum</i>) as Influenced by Weed Management Practices and Vermicompost Application[J]. Legume research, 2022(1):45. 7. The data from the three repeated experiments did not reflect the average value and did not undergo statistical analysis. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	The quality of the English language is still somewhat lacking and needs to be polished and modified.	
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>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Lihua Zhang
Department, University & Country	College of Food Science and Pharmaceutical Engineering, Zaozhuang University, China