

SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_119489
Title of the Manuscript:	Influence of Different Levels of NPK, Biochar and Azotobacter on Physico- Chemical Properties of Soil on Cowpea (Vigna unguiculata)
Type of Article :	

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
<p>I corrected 1st manuscript with track changes. Each and every one I was done. But the same mistake was made in 2nd one also.</p> <p>Do not use abbreviations in the abstract. The same mistake was made in the previous manuscript. I mentioned that. But you have not corrected. .</p> <p>Where is the conclusion in abstract? It was missed in your previous manuscript also.</p> <p>Scientific words should be italicized. The same mistake was made in 2nd one also.</p> <p>Poor introduction. This should be sounded</p> <p>No reference in methodology. The same mistake was made in 2nd one also.</p> <p>Wrong SI units. The same mistake was made in 2nd one also like 1st manuscript.</p> <p>Proper references missing in 1st and 2nd manuscripts both. Changes have not been made .</p> <p>Table 1 missing in Manuscript 1. The same mistake happens in manuscript 2.</p> <p>You have discussed only about T1 and T9i9n data sections. How about other treatments? You must explain that also. It is missing in 1st manuscript also. You should address each comment given by the reviewers.</p> <p>3.3 and 3.4 sections empty. Nothing mentioned.</p> <p>Discuss each and every data with the reason and previous research data. Ver poor data and discussion part. . It is missing in 1st manuscript also. Nothing done for the revised manuscript.</p> <p>You should explain your data and discuss it with previous research data.</p> <p>Poor reference usage. Should refer more research articles.</p> <p>Previous comments are</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The presentation is really poor.2. Very poor abstract. Must be rewritten with proper objectives, methodology, data and conclusion. Here objective and conclusion missing	

SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

<p>3. 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</p> <p>4. 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.</p>	
--	--

Reviewer Details:

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