

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Journal of Plant &amp; Soil Science</a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJPSS_118532</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Role of fermented organic manure and mycorrhiza on physio-chemical properties of soil and growth of green gram (Vigna radiata L.) var. PDM-139.</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.journalajsspn.com/index.php/AJSSPN/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. 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. Yes, it is important considering the importance of green gram in supplying protein.</p> <p>2. No, because the content only dwell on physio-chemical properties of soil, therefore, I will suggest "Role of fermented organic manure and mycorrhiza on physio-chemical properties of soil and yield of green gram (<i>Vigna radiata</i> L.) Var. PDM-139." By adding results of yield determination across the treatments not average yield per hectare.</p> <p>3. Yes, but add a conclusion and reduce the usage of definitive word "The" because it looks like your discussing the results instead of stating the results. For example instead of "The maximum pore size recorded..." you can say, "Maximum pore size was recorded..."</p> <p>4. There were no subsections, it will be more appropriate if you have subsections especially in materials and methods.</p> <p>5. Yes its scientifically okay</p> <p>6. Yes, but only 35% are recent, consider using recent literatures, which will help you to present your data on parameters for growth and yield determinations.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Yes it is	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	The article is scientific, but the methodology and the results do not defines or matches the title. Therefore, the author may consider taking my suggestion above by adding just yield parameters and presenting results across all the treatment levels he has. Or he may remove the plant and take "Role of fermented organic manure and mycorrhiza on the improvement of physio-chemical properties of soil".	

### 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:	Geraldin B. Dela Cruz
Department, University & Country	Tarlac Agricultural University, Phillipines