

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_126951
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Solid and Liquid Manures on growth and Yield of Maize (Zea mays L.) in Malwa region of Punjab
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the 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>

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <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 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.	This manuscript is valuable for its focus on sustainable nutrient management in maize through solid and liquid manures in Punjab's Malwa region. It provides practical insights into improving crop yield and soil health, supporting eco-friendly farming practices.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
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.	Needs clarity Add background statement and objective The abstract effectively outlines the experimental setup and major findings but lacks a clear statement of purpose and broader implications. Streamlining the content and emphasizing critical results would improve readability and relevance for the scientific community.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	No, needs addition	
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.	This manuscript is scientifically robust due to its clear experimental design, appropriate methodology, and use of relevant organic fertilizers. The Randomized Block Design with replications ensures statistical reliability, while soil analysis enhances the understanding of treatment effects on soil fertility. By addressing a gap in the literature, the study makes a valuable contribution to sustainable maize cultivation in the Malwa region.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	It needs recent references. References are old....adding past 4 year references could enhance the discussion	

Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Needs improvement</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The Introduction is informative but could be more concise and focused. Repetitive points on the benefits of organic fertilizers should be streamlined. The research gap—limited comparative studies on solid and liquid manure treatments for maize in the Malwa region—should be clearly highlighted to emphasize the study's significance. Structuring the discussion to address solid and liquid manures separately before comparing them would improve flow. Simplifying sentences, such as revising "Liquid organic formulations have not received much attention in mainstream scientific literature" to "Liquid organic fertilizers are underexplored despite their benefits," would enhance clarity and readability. The Materials and Methods section can be improved by enhancing clarity and avoiding repetition. Clearly state the experimental design, including the Randomized Block Design, number of replications, and plot size, to help readers understand the setup. Simplify treatment descriptions by using consistent terminology, such as replacing "VC" with "vermicompost" throughout. Briefly mention the parameters tested during the soil sample's chemical analysis for better context. Avoid repeating the site description and condense it into a single, concise statement. Revise phrases like "A long-term experiment was being conducted" to accurately reflect the study's status using past or present tense. These changes will improve precision and readability.add statistical analysis</p> <p>The manuscript is well-written, with a clear and logical flow. Some parts of the results section could be more concise, but overall the information is organized well.</p> <p>The conclusion clearly summarizes the key findings of the study, but it could be more concise.</p>	

PART 2:

	<p>Reviewer's comment</p>	<p>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>
<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>	

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Kalaivani J</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Tamil Nadu Agricultural University, India</p>