

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Journal of Plant &amp; Soil Science</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_86241
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of seed treatment and phosphorus on growth and yield of green gram (Vigna radiata L.)
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

	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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- This manuscript is without keywords. Please add, at least, four words related in this manuscript.</li> <li>- It is better that you start abstract with a different sentence, for instance about the role of phosphor or the importance of the plant that used in this experiment or other sentences like this.</li> <li>- It is necessary that should be use the conclusion sentence at the end of abstract.</li> <li>- Introduction is too short. The sentences didn't explain both of the importance of the experiment and the role of elements in growth or other factors related to manuscript.</li> <li>- At last of introduction part, it should have said an aim or final expectation about this work. It has no hypothesis or expectation at last of introduction!</li> <li>- References are too short and it is better to expand your sentences with more references.</li> <li>- In part of method and materials, how did the experiment analyse? Which method have you used for data analyse? Please explain completely? What method has been used for doing experiments? Please explain completely.</li> <li>- In part of results and discussion, don't use abbreviation. Instead of writing, for instance, "no. of branches" write the word completely. You can use abbreviation in next sentences but not as a short in title.</li> <li>- Almost in whole of manuscript, it is used "maximum results were found". It is important to use more explanation and better discussion for your results instead of using cliché sentence without any explanation. It is no discuss in support of your results and the author just has used out of date sentences</li> <li>- Conclusion is too short without any extra information.</li> <li>- None of the tables has explanation about the analyse method and significant level.</li> </ul>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Instead of using the name of treatment in all of the abstract and text, use the abbreviations.</li> </ul>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-</li> <li>- It is better to use "T1, T2, ...." Instead of name of the treatment in each tables.</li> </ul>	

### 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)
<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:	Naghmeh Daneshvar Hakimi Meybodi
Department, University & Country	Tehran university, Iran