

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_91740
Title of the Manuscript:	Survey to assess the quality of groundnut seeds used by the farmers of Tiruvannamalai district of Tamil Nadu
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	See the balloons attached to the manuscript.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	Readability of the manuscript.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<p>Introduction and results and discussion were under disadvantage by the data analysis and readability.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. My first observation is the choice by the authors of the current Journal, but it is ok. However, the soil characteristics have to be part of the methodology.</li> <li>2. The manuscript is a survey in determined locals. This means fixed variables under analysis. Please highlight the coordinates.</li> <li>3. In my opinion, a survey evaluated better random effects than fixed ones. See, only one district was reported, but samples have to be get randomly from the farmers. The authors have fixed and random effect. This is not reported in MM. In my review, the data analysis failed.</li> <li>4. The authors have the opportunity of evaluating 10 samples, thus the best choice is to analyse by EDA. Please, type <i>Nature methods and statistics</i>; there, you can find the method of <i>box-and-whiskers plots</i>. It is free for download. Finally, you change the Tables for figures and discuss the variation inside every place that you tried to do.</li> </ol> <p>The reason:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The original application of data analysis; see above <i>original research article</i>;</li> <li>2. The Tables are poor designed.</li> <li>3. The author will be assertive in the analysis</li> <li>4. The readers will have assertive understanding of the field responses.</li> <li>5. The most important: is to get followers that are good for the author and for the journal.</li> </ol> <p>Take your time. I hope I have helped you.</p>	

### 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:	José Walter Pedroza Carneiro
Department, University & Country	U.E.M, Brazil