

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Plant &amp; Soil Science</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJPSS_120317</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Response of Inorganic, Integrated and Organic Sources of Nutrients on Growth and Yield of Cabbage</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

#### **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://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

#### **Important Policies regarding Peer Review**

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	<b>Author's Feedback</b> <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write few sentences regarding the importance this manuscript for scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript is good for scientific community because it discuss a method of improving the yield of cabbage production It give the best ratio of combining organic and inorganic fertilizers for best yield	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes but can recast as  Response of Inorganic, Organic and Integrated Sources of Nutrients on Growth and Yield of Cabbage	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract is comprehensive	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
Please write few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript is well written but the research data were not exposed enough to statistical analyses The replica seems not considered, since there were no range in the Table data Means were not statistically compared to give a good measure of comparison of the performance of the treatments That was why the level of significance difference between the means were not specified.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. -	Most of the references were not recent	

**Review Form 3**

Minor REVISION comments  Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, the English is good	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Isah, Mohammed Chado</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Ibrahim Badamasi Babangida University, Nigeria</b>