

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Plant &amp; Soil Science</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJPSS_119489</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Influence of Different Levels of NPK, Biochar and Azotobacter on Physico- Chemical Properties of Soil on Cowpea (Vigna unguiculata)</b>
Type of the 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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p><b>Yes. But the presentation is really poor.</b></p> <p><b>Yes</b></p> <p><b>No. Very poor abstract. Must be rewritten with proper objectives, methodology, data and conclusion. Here objective and conclusion missing.</b></p> <p><b>No. Not at all. Very poor introduction. Absent references. No objectives. No proper data and discussion part is missing. No proper conclusion. A lot of grammatical mistakes and wrong SI units. Very poor graph drawings. At least no italics of scientific names. Have not mentioned Methodology soundly.</b></p> <p><b>Not at all. Totally wrong.</b></p> <p><b>Not at all. Totally wrong. No reference in the introduction. More than 90 years old references have been used. No reference in data and discussion part. The writing of references is wrong.</b></p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	Not at all.	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	Very poor manuscript. Cannot accept at all.	

**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)
<p><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>N. U. S. Dissanayake</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Sri Jayewardenepura, Sri Lanka</b>