

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Plant &amp; Soil Science</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJPSS_121406</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Elucidating the role of micronutrient seed treatment in the physiological performance of wheat seed</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

#### **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**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<b>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.</b>		
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>		
<b>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.</b>		
<b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>		
<b>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.</b>		
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>		

**Review Form 3**

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p><b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>		
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>As a peer reviewer, I would provide the following critical review and suggestions for improvement:</p> <p>Critical Review:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The abstract is comprehensive and provides a good overview of the study. However, it could be more concise and focused on key findings.</li> <li>2. The introduction provides relevant background information on pulses and lentils. It effectively establishes the importance of weed management in lentil cultivation.</li> <li>3. The materials and methods section is brief and lacks some important details, such as the duration of the experiment, plot size, and specific dates of operations.</li> <li>4. The results and discussion section presents the findings clearly, but lacks in-depth analysis and comparison with existing literature.</li> <li>5. The conclusion is concise but could be more comprehensive in summarizing the key findings and their implications.</li> <li>6. The tables are informative but could be formatted better for easier readability.</li> <li>7. The statistical analysis seems appropriate, but more details on the analysis methods would be beneficial.</li> <li>8. The reference list is relevant but appears limited and could be expanded to include more recent studies.</li> </ol> <p>Suggestions for Improvement:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Expand the materials and methods section to include more details on the experimental design, plot size, and specific dates of operations.</li> <li>2. Provide more information on the environmental conditions during the experiment, including temperature, rainfall, and soil characteristics.</li> <li>3. Include a more detailed description of the weed species present in the experimental field.</li> <li>4. Enhance the results and discussion section by comparing your findings with similar studies from different regions or under different conditions.</li> <li>5. Add a separate discussion section to delve deeper into the implications of your results and their potential applications.</li> <li>6. Include an economic analysis of the different weed management practices to provide practical information for farmers.</li> <li>7. Improve the formatting and presentation of tables for better readability. Consider adding visual aids such as graphs or charts to illustrate key findings.</li> <li>8. Expand the literature review in the introduction to include more recent studies on weed management in lentils.</li> <li>9. Provide more details on the statistical analysis methods used, including any software employed.</li> <li>10. Discuss the limitations of the study and suggest areas for future research.</li> <li>11. Include a brief section on the practical implications of your findings for lentil farmers.</li> <li>12. Consider adding a short section on the environmental impacts of the different weed management practices studied.</li> <li>13. Proofread the manuscript carefully to correct any minor grammatical or typographical errors.</li> <li>14. Expand the conclusion to include broader implications of the study and recommendations for farmers and researchers.</li> <li>15. Update and expand the reference list to include more recent and diverse sources, ensuring all cited works are included.</li> </ol> <p>These improvements would enhance the overall quality and impact of the paper, making it more comprehensive and valuable to the scientific community and practitioners in the field.</p>	

### Review Form 3

#### **PART 2:**

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

#### **Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Saswatik Tripathy</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>India</b>