

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Plant &amp; Soil Science</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJPSS_118465</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Evaluating the Impact of Fertilisers and Elicitors on Amaranthus cruentus (L): Sustainable Fertilization and Elicitation Strategies for Enhanced Nutrition and Productivity</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### **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>Yes</p> <p>The title is too long (shorten or leave the first "Impact of Fertilisers and Elicitors on growth and quality of <i>Amaranthus cruentus</i> (L)")</p> <p>The abstract needs addition of the problem statement to make it comprehensive</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Some references are not complete e.g 15, which style of referencing style is the author using its mixed up</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>Yes. However, the font style and type is not consistent as seen from the abstract. The abstract contains grammatical errors.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>The Introduction lacks the connection with the main factors of the title; for example, the elicitors have not been mentioned anywhere in the introductory part; At least indicate some of the cited works about the phytohormones.</p> <p>a good paper but needs some revision especially on the introduction</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><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:	Moses Njoka
Department, University & Country	Meru University, Kenya