

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_85259
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Seaweed (Gracilaria edulis) Extract and Phosphorus on Growth and Economic of a Black gram (Vigna mungo 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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	The material has a logical structure and clear writing, which makes it easier for the reader to follow the author's reasoning. The methods are presented in a direct and appropriate way. The results and discussions are consistent with the article's proposal. Likewise, the way chosen to present and comment on the results is very didactic, and clearly demonstrates the association between one of the soil treatments and higher rates of plant development. Likewise, the material shows that this same type of soil treatment has a better economic return.	I have revised as per reviewer's comment.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The figures presented are interesting and relevant, but they were not mentioned in the text of the article. I think it would be interesting to include in the abstract the name of the country in which the research was carried out. Remember that the reader will not necessarily be aware of the regional divisions of India. In the Introduction I missed information about where Black gram [Vigna mungo L.] is naturally found, and a (brief) history of its use by humans.	I have revised as per reviewer's comment.
<u>Optional/General</u> 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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	