

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_89964
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Organic Manures and Inorganic Fertilizers on Growth, Yield and Quality of Bottle gourd (<i>Lagenaria siceraria</i> Mol.) standl
Type of the 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>)

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	In Introduction chapter verify the data related to area and production. Include 2020-21 data. In production UP state ranks second after Bihar. Write the importance of other organic manures. In Materials and methods mention the coordinates , soil nutrient status, design of the experiment, treatment number, replications, variety used, date of sowing, spacing adopted, in how many plants observations were made, time of observation etc. Treatment schedule is not balanced. Why 75% NPK and 25% goat manure is not included. In treatment combination whether the balance of NPK was applied in the form of organic manures or out of total Recommended organic manure 75% was applied. Clarity is needed. In results interpretation is very poor, stereo type presentation, mistakes in calculation of yield per plant , recalculate the yield per ha and same is mentioned wherever necessary, Discussion is totally lacking. Many references quoted in the text are missing in reference and vice-versa. In the text arrange the references chronologically. Cv values seems to be very low. Result has to be written elaborately. Specify the reason for the best performance of the treatments with less NPK application. Carry out all the corrections made in red ink	
Minor REVISION comments	Conclusion consists of only few lines	
Optional/General comments	The authors simply want to publish a paper without applying their mind. Results were written erratically	

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	M. Meyyappan
Department, University & Country	Annamalai University, India