

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Journal of Plant &amp; Soil Science</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_79735
Title of the Manuscript:	Conjoint Application of INM Modules on Vegetative, Flowering and Seed Yield in French Marigold
Type of the Article	Original 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:

(<https://www.journalijpss.com/index.php/IJPSS/editorial-policy> )

**Review Form 1.6**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments	<p>Keyword: Some are repeated in the title. Please change these.</p> <p>Introduction: A paragraph is needed that explains (and some values) how fertilization influences the variables studied. There is only one citation, but it is necessary to justify the sentences with citations. Please add more. Add the scientific name of the plant.</p> <p>MM: It is not explained which are the variables that were measured and how they were measured. In addition, a short description of what each variable means would be interesting.</p> <p>Results and discussion: The results must be rewritten. Because of how they are presented, it is not possible to observe statistically significant differences between treatments. Perhaps a tukey test for each variable if the ANOVA is significant would help I am afraid that many of the differences observed between the treatments are not statistically significant and that determine the writing of the results and discussion. The table and graphics must be referenced in the text.</p> <p>Conclusion and abstract should be rewritten based on the comments for the results.</p>	
<b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments	<p>Figure 3 could be put into two figures because the scales between the two variables are very different</p>	
<b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments		

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<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>Fermin Gortari</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Universidad Nacional de Misiones, Argentina</b>