

Review Form 1.7

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 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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. The manuscript reported the effect of different level of npk, biochar and azotobacter on physico-chemical properties of soil on cowpea. This study was important for science community since Cowpea is one of the important agricultural product in India.</p> <p>2. Yes, the title of the manuscript is suitable.</p> <p>3. The abstract is comprehensive and scientific. But, the first sentence is incompleted and please have a revise.</p> <p>4. The structure of the manuscript is appropriate.</p> <p>5. Yes, the data contain in manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>6. The references are sufficient but not in sequence. The first citation in the manuscript should be 1 instead of 11. Please done the citation in sequence. Also, the year of the references used in manuscript should be within 5 years from the year of published.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Please review the language thoroughly since some grammatical errors and typo still exist</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The manuscript is suitable for publication after minor correction.</p>	

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>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:

Name:	Yeo Shi Hao
Department, University & Country	University Technology Malaysia, Malaysia