

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_87069
Title of the Manuscript:	Impact of organic manures and foliar spray of moringa leaf extract (<i>Moringa oleifera</i> L.) on growth and yield of Rice bean [<i>Vigna umbellata</i> (Thunb.) Ohwi and Ohashi]
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>1) The title should be written all in upper case or capitalized each word.</p> <p>2) Can you tell us about what organic manure mean? Before you tell us its contents and importance</p> <p>3) Why you choose goat manure? Why not for other animals? What makes goat manure special? You have tell us something about it b/c you have already choose it.</p> <p>4) You have missed your problem statement in your research. Why we do a research? It is to fill the gaps. What is lacking in your study area really that initiated you to design this study? So you have to tell us about it. Do farmers in your study area currently growing Rice bean using organic manures? If so what they lack? Is our research interventions make significant role for farmers in relation to what they are currently using in their farming system?</p> <p>5) Though out your writings be consistent to use either Kg/ha or Kg ha⁻¹ please!</p> <p>6) Why you use Randomised Block Design? b/c you have more than two factors. The appropriate design should have been factorial RCBD.</p> <p>7) Can you tell us your experimental plot size please!</p> <p>8) What was you linear model used to analyse your data. Show us briefly.</p> <p>9) Your Table 1 is talking about the nutritional value of fresh leaves vs powder not about plant height so where is your data???</p> <p>10) Is there significant difference b/n treatment 8 and 9? Which one is economical advantageous to recommend? Look at it thoroughly please!</p> <p>11) Yield and related data is presented at Table 6 not in Table 5 so need to revise all your table data.</p> <p>12) Look at trt 8, Could you see significant differences with trt 9 when related to economic importance?</p> <p>13) Where is your economic feasibility analysis before you indicated it in your conclusion?</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>-Be consistent in your writing and idea flow.</p> <p>-Sometimes you missed making full stop at the end of your sentence. You should not forget it please.</p> <p>-The conclusion section is too short and limited so some imported points should be stated briefly.</p>	
Optional/General comments		

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Netsanet Abera Muluneh
Department, University & Country	Ethiopian Institute of Agricultural Research (EIAR), Pawe Agricultural Research Center (PARC), Ethiopia