

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_101291
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Sulphur and foliar Application of Boron on Growth and Yield attributes of Lentil (Lens culinaris 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>)

### 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  1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)  2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)  3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?  4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?  5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?  6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.  (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	  1. High yields are of concern to meet food security requirements. Studies are carried out to improve yields and have bump harvests. It is in this notion that this research was done.  2. Suitable  3. Not comprehensive. An abstract contains a brief background of the research, research gap, proposed solution, aims, Objectives, methodology, results, discussion, conclusions and recommendations. Please Redo 4. Appropriate  5. Yes  6. Yes, though a 1984 reference is too old to refer to now	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	yes	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The abstract is badly done -the methodology is shallow - the conclusion need expansion	

### 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)	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	Shumba Tobias Takawira
Department, University & Country	Harare Polytechnic, Zimbabwe