

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_125908
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Time of Foliar Application of Different Bio-Stimulants on Growth, Yield and Economics of Chickpea (<i>Cicer arietinum</i> L.) in Mid Hills of Himachal Pradesh
Type of the Article	

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)
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>The present manuscript is important for both scientists and farmers as the research is focused on foliar application of different biostimulants in chickpea cultivation. The foliar application of biostimulants is known to play a crucial role in modern crop production. Foliar application allows plants to absorb nutrients directly through their leaves, bypassing soil-related issues like poor nutrient availability or adverse soil conditions. Biostimulants help plants cope with abiotic stresses such as drought, salinity, and extreme temperatures by enhancing their natural defense mechanisms. This leads to improved resilience and sustained growth under challenging conditions. By promoting better nutrient absorption and stress tolerance, foliar biostimulants can significantly boost plant growth and crop yields. This is particularly beneficial in intensive farming systems where maximizing productivity is essential. Using biostimulants reduces the need for chemical fertilizers and pesticides, leading to more sustainable and environmentally friendly agricultural practices. Foliar application of biostimulants is a valuable tool for enhancing crop production, improving plant health, and promoting sustainable agriculture.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title identify correctly and exactly the content of manuscript.</p>	
<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>	<p>The abstract states the scope and objectives of the research, the main conclusion drawn from the research. In my opinion, it is not necessary to present detailed information about the soil characteristics in the abstract.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The manuscript is well-structured. The manuscript is correctly divided into the major sections and subsections.</p>	
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>The effects of different biostimulants and the timing of their application on the growth, yield and economic indicators of chickpea grown under the specific conditions of Mid Hills of Himachal Pradesh were studied. The authors have adequately discussed the results obtained. The results of the experiment are presented correctly and well organized for the readers. The research will be important to the scientific community and agricultural sector.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>The number of references is sufficient and relevant to research needs.</p>	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The manuscript submitted for review should be published after minor corrections.	
Optional/General comments	Small corrections should be made. For example, instead of „...analysis of variance technique as suggested by (Panse and Sukhatme 1967) was employed“, the authors should be cited as follows: analysis of variance technique as suggested by Panse and Sukhatme (1967) was employed. In several places the year of publication should be in brackets, for example: instead of "According to Kumawat et al. 2009" should be cited as "According to Kumawat et al. (2009)". Are vermiwash, jeevamrit and panchagavya commercial products? If they are, it would be good to describe the composition of the biostimulants. In the MATERIALS AND METHODS section a description of "Seed index" and "B: C ratio" should be given. No competing interests exist in this manuscript. There are no ethical issues in this manuscript.	

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Radka Bozhinova
Department, University & Country	Agricultural Academy, Tobacco and Tobacco Products Institute, Bulgaria