

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_127676
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Bio-fertilizers on growth attributes of broccoli (<i>Brassica oleracea</i> var. <i>italica</i> L.)
Type of the Article	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: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript is important from the point of agriculture.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
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 authors must include significance of the work in the abstract. The abstract is poorly written.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	No	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The authors must include recent references.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The English language is poor.	
Optional/General comments	1) The abstract is poorly written. The authors have not included significance of the work in the abstract. 2) The materials and methods must be explained in detail. 3) The results must be expressed as average of replicates +/- standard deviation. 4) The discussion section is missing. 5) The conclusion section is poorly written. 6) The English language is poor. 7) The authors must include recent references in the manuscript.	

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:	Aparna Gunjal
Department, University & Country	Dr. D. Y. Patil, Arts, Commerce & Science College, India