Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	**International Journal of Plant & Soil Science**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_IJPSS_106109**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Effect Of Indole-3-Acetic Acid and Nano-Urea on Agronomic Attributes of Radish Crops**
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)

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)*
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)**	**1. Yes. The manuscript is important since it addresses the challenge of food security.** **2. Somehow. If 'attributes' is replaced with 'Properties', it will sound better.** **3. Not very comprehensive. The methods are not so clear in the abstract.** 4. No. Same results have been presented in tables and figures and I do not see why that is necessary. 5. The scientific rigour of experimentation and analysis is missing since experimental set-up was not clear for all the experiments (all the eight treatments and their triplicates) and the statistical tools used to perform the analysis is missing. The study reported of taking soil samples and analysing for some parameters but as to when these samples were taken and analysed is not stated. Initial and after soil sample analysis is crucial to ascertain the effects of these chemicals on soil, which will consequently inform treatment options. In like manner, it is not clear what the various treatment combinations were made of. As it stands now it can only be assumed that the treatments were made of the description of nutrients formation under Materials and Methods for all the applications, which will be problematic because more nutrients are added on as treatment progresses. Optimal fertilization is needed to prove the efficiency of the nutrients because more fertilization with different fertilizer combinations could be detrimental to crop health in terms of excess accumulation in crops as well as environmental health. 6. The literature used in the manuscript is scanty and it can be deduced from the discussion that thorough literature review was not performed. The discussin does not provide any insight as to why the differences in the crop growth parameters and the contributing factor regarding the active ingredients that caused the growth changes. 7. No recommendations were made for farmers regarding the use of these fertilizer recommendations and what it means for the farming systems. 8.	
Minor REVISION comments **1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**	The language is good.	
Optional/General comments	Background introduction of the manuscript is shallow. It lacks assessment of the economic importance of the crop in terms of ready market and storage duration. The problem statement which addresses the need for this research is also missing, except for the nutritional value that the crop provides. Since it is easier to produce, the authors could have included why it is important to include so much different fertilizers to produce them. Authors should check section 3.2 of the manuscript - effect of root length on radish plant? Authors should be clear and explain why the control treatment differed in their crop growth parameters for all the experiments.	

Review Form 1.7

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:	**Mary Antwi**
Department, University & Country	**University of Energy and Natural Resources, Ghana**