

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_121183
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECT OF BLACK SOLDIER FLY LARVAL FRASS ON GROWTH AND YIELD OF RADISH (<i>Raphanus sativus</i> L.)
Type of the 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 <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
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.	Exploring the interface between plant biology and soil characteristics, the manuscript expounds a current problem, that of finding alternative organic sources, such as black soldier fly (BSF) larval frass. Due to the high waste degradation efficiency (66-79%) and pathogen reduction capability of BSF larvae, the authors present the effect of frass on growth and yield of radish (<i>Raphanus sativus</i> L.).	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, the title of the article is suitable, expressing the essence of the research.	
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.	The abstract of the article clearly states the purpose of the study, the experimental design and the results obtained.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The structure of the manuscript respects the sections of a well-written research paper, according to the journal.	
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.	The experimental design employed was the Randomized Block Design with eight treatments and three replications. The physico-chemical properties of the soil and the chemical properties of BSF larval frass and vermicompost used in experiment were taken into account. The data collected from the research study was statistically analysed (ANOVA). The growth parameters (plant height, number of leaves per plant and dry matter production) and the yield Radish characters (root length, root girth, fresh root weight, yield) were correlated with the variants of applied treatment.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =	The study cites 27 various bibliographic references (articles and books), most of them from the last 10 years.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, the language/English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The study is interesting, addressing topics from the circular economy and ecological management, testing variants of new source of organic manure (BSF larval frass) along with vermicompost to improve the growth and yield parameters of Radish.	

Review Form 3

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:	Daniela Giosanu
Department, University & Country	National University of Science and Technology Politehnica Bucharest, Pitești University Centre, Romania