

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_88980
Title of the Manuscript:	Performance of Groundnut Varieties in Kallakurichi district Through Farmer Participatory Mode
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>)

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>Abstract:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -The abstract must be devoid of unstandardized abbreviations like TMV, CO 7, FLD and ICAR. They must be written in full. Abbreviations in subsequent sections could be used. -Methodology or approach used in generating the study's results must be summarized in a sentence and integrated in the abstract after the main aim of the study. <p>Introduction:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Research progress regarding what is known about the topic or scope of this study and unknown, but important to be studied has not been captured in the introduction. -Authors can integrate some global underlying theories, sustainable development goals and economic or livelihood framework parameters linked to the key subject of this study or agriculture to enrich the introductory aspect. -What is the contribution of this study to existing knowledge? It must be made clear or integrated in the last paragraph. <p>Materials and methods</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Any justification for the methods used in collecting and analysis data collected? Which existing studies used the said approach and how standard are they in validating findings. --In what mode were farmers engaged? -How many farmers were engaged? How representative is the said number? <p>Results and discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Authors need to adequately discuss/digest/explain the results obtained by considering some external factors, policies, plans and programs that influenced the results of this study. -Again, implications going forward on several sectors, along with uncertainties could be chipped in to make the discussion section extensive. There is the need to refer or compare current findings with more literature on dynamisms linked to the scope of this study. -Tables 1-4 were not thoroughly discussed pertaining to the results presented and the linkages between them. -Authors could add recommendations based on results generated for this study. <p>Conclusion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -The conclusion is too brief. Authors should integrate the significance of the study to policy-makers, international scientific community/researchers, industrial players and so on. -What were the challenges encountered when conducting this study? Any study limitations that could propel or drive future studies? These parameters must be included in the concluding section. <p>References:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Authors need to reference this appropriately. It must be referenced as: <p>Name of author(s)/organisation, year of publication, title of the project or article or report, institution involved/publisher, country followed by a link to the site the piece was retrieved from or published for link/web-</p>	

Review Form 1.6

	based references.	
Minor REVISION comments	-Authors should thoroughly check the manuscript to correct some major or moderate grammatical defects and syntax errors which were identified.	
Optional/General comments	The manuscript is publishable, but not in its current state. Authors need to integrate the suggested comments to improve the overall nature of the manuscript.	

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:	Isaac Sarfo
Department, University & Country	Nanjing University of Information Science and Technology, China