

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_75266
Title of the Manuscript:	Response of organic manure and Azotobacter on quality and leaf nutrient status of strawberry (Fragaria x ananassa Duch.) cv. Winter Dawn
Type of the Article	Research Article

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:

(<http://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-policy>)

Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	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>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<p>I find the paper by the authors so fascinating especially with their decision to tackle the impact of organic manure use and bio fertilization on the horticulture industry given its prime importance to the economy of India and the overall health of the population.</p> <p>HOWEVER, the authors should</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The title should be changed. It has been indicated in the manuscript. In its current state, it is not sounding academic. 2. Reorganize the paper and ensure that it flows from general (Global outlook) to particular (Case of India). 3. The portion of India should be strengthened with facts and figures as shown in the manuscript 4. The problem and objective of the study should stand out before materials and methods 5. The biggest challenge with this paper is the flow of methodology. It is far TOO SKETCHY. The details of missing components have been indicated by the reviewer and should be attended to carefully if the readers are to develop confidence in the authenticity of the results. 6. The months of the years should also be indicated 7. For each procedure followed, ensure that you provide a justification. MORE is indicated in the tracked manuscript 	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<p>The reference list has some digressions. The authors seem to have paid less attention to the journal citation and referencing guidelines. I have indicated some of the key correction points in the Manuscript (References 1,6,12,15, 22,26 and 27)</p> <p>I have equally included a reminder message that when the paper is updated, the new references should observe coherence.</p>	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	<p>I have corrected some of the few typos in the paper. The authors can ensure that they are updated.</p> <p>When the authors are discussing the results, they should base on scientific knowledge before cross referencing other studies. I indicated this in the manuscript</p>	

Review Form 1.6

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> Yes , the authors mention methods used but they fail to tell the reader where the manufacturer and guidelines by the inventors of the methods were followed. This is very important	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Jane Alexander Ruley</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>University Of Juba, South Sudan</i>