

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_123514
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of magnetized irrigation water and seeds on the production of OKRA (Hibiscus esculentus)
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Actually, I recommended this manuscript to be out to scientific community after doing some refinements. Since the technology of magnetization has been newly introduced in Sudan this will encourage the researchers there to do positive add in this subject of scientific research.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes it is suitable	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Yes it is	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, they are	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	To increase the strength of the manuscript and to be scientifically robust and technically sound the authors should do some refinements: They don't mention the magnetic field strength that used. Are they can do optimisation on magnetic field strength? If they add figures of magnetic water and seeds devices this will be beater, also the schematic diagram for the experiment is preferable. The model of magnetic devices should be mentioned They talk many times about "significant difference $p < 0.05$ " but don't define it and how it is calculated. Also there is little pit typing mistakes	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes, the references sufficient and recent	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	English quality is suitable	
Optional/General comments		

Review Form 3

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Safaa Saeid Mohamed Ali
Department, University & Country	National Research Centre, Egypt