

Review Form 3

JournalName:	InternationalJournalof Plant&SoilScience
ManuscriptNumber:	Ms_IJPSS_120641
TitleoftheManuscript:	EffectOfBio-FormulationOnEnhancementOfSeedQuality AndYieldInGardenPea
TypeoftheArticle	

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript is important for good crop production and crop improvement purposes. In a time like this where there are challenges like global food insecurity and environmental pollution/degradation, there is need for studies like this that tests the efficacy and efficiency of bio-formulations (over synthetic fertilizers) in the improvement of crop quality and yield. From this investigation, combined application of PSB @ 10g/kg + <i>Rhizobium</i> @ 20g/kg could be promoted for future recommendation as a seed priming treatment in pea, and this would be very useful to the scientific community.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes it is suitable	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Yes, it is	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
Please write few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	I believe this manuscript is scientifically correct because the aim, objective, and methodology of this study were clearly defined and scientifically robust. The methodology was informed by literature and it is reasonable. The experimental designs used for both the field and lab experiments were also quite good and correct. The results gotten from the study also were reasonable and were adequately justified and discussed.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. -	I believe the references were sufficient for the size of the study. I would advise the author however, to utilize the articles they've cited properly though (especially in the result and discussion section). In some cases, it seemed like the references were only listed and not enough information were provided.	
Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes it is. I made a few corrections but they were minor and can be easily corrected.	
Minor REVISION 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 3](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Abidemi Benjamen Atteh
Department, University & Country	University of Stirling, United Kingdom