

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	Original research paper

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>)

Review Form 1.7

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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Yes, the manuscript is important for scientific community</p> <p>Not suitable enough, better captioned as “ Influence or Effects of vermicompost and phosphorus-solubilizing-bacteria on growth and yield of onion”.</p> <p>Not at all. Methodology is scanty and no conclusion in the abstract</p> <p>No. Abstract not detail, Introduction is scanty with no rationale of study and objectives, Methodology is also scanty lacking experimental procedures and method of data collection and analysis.</p> <p>Yes, but needs to be well written in line with suggested corrections</p> <p>References are inadequate. Some statements require referencing in the write-up.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Language quality is not bad</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Let the author follow suggestions as spelt out in the manuscript</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:	Oyatokun Olukayode Stephen
Department, University & Country	Ajayi Crowther University, Nigeria