



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	MS: 2012/IJPSS/2401
Title of the Manuscript:	PERFORMANCE OF OKRA (<i>Abelmoschus esculentus</i> (L) Moench) UNDER VARIOUS APPLICATION OF PESTICIDES AND FERTILIZERS IN OXIC PALEUSTALF

General guideline for Peer Review process is available in this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

- This form has total 9 parts. Kindly note that you should use all the parts of this review form.



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Compulsory REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In line no. 2 the word "okra" can be kept with in parenthesis instead of (<i>A. esculentus</i> (L) Moench) and can be followed in the rest of the text. 2. Line no. 14 and 15 should be in the same paragraph. 3. In line no. 16 and 17 the unit should be 'ml' not 'mls' and same should be followed through out. 4. Line no. 24 and 25 should be in the same paragraph. 5. In line no. 50 the word "resulted" should be "resorted" 6. Line no. 53 reconstruct the sentence "synthetic....times past." 7. Line no. 58 – 66 give the reference to support the statement made. 8. Line no. 76 "NPK 15:15:15" is not clear....should it not be "NPK 1:1:1?" 9. Line no. 81 to 86 give reference 10. Line no. 83 reconstruct the sentence "Globally now,....pollution effect." 11. Line no. 132 How can a plot dimension be of 1.2 cmx6cm1.2cm is too less. Please check. 12. Line no. 134 "neem plant extract" ...it should be specifically mention which part of the plant was usedlike leaf or flower or what? 13. Line no. 141 "various weight of leaves"specific weights should be mentioned. 14. In line no. 155 and 156 the data on pH and CEC mentioned are not matching with the data mentioned in the table 1 	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>15. Line no. 160. It is not possible to compare as the data are not correct in the table 1</p> <p>16. Line no. 220 and 221 “ application of neem.....plant. is not clear.</p> <p>17. Line no 249. Reference needed.</p> <p>18. Line no 272 to 278. Conclusion should be about major findings of this particular study only</p> <p>19. Line no. 387 – 403 in table 1. There is no mention of number of observation (N) –alphabet A, B, C.....etc. are not defined. –the values of pH are too low. – check all the data in the table. –textural class of soil should be given. –same should be followed for the table 2</p> <p>20. Line no. 423 – 452. Table 3. The alphabets beside the data of column “plant height” are not defined— same should be for the following tables.</p>	
--	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The topic is an interesting one but presentation of data is not satisfactory. 2. The result section is not written well and there is discrepancy between the data presented in the table 1 and that mentioned in the result section. 3. It would have been better if result and discussion sections can be written together. 4. The data presented in the tables is difficult to understand quickly because of numerous data presented in a single table (1 and 2). Some of the data can be graphically presented for convenience of understanding of differences among the treatment results. 	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Dr. Samiran Roy
Department, University & Country	Department of Environmental Studies, Royal University of Bhutan, Bhutan