

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Plant &amp; Soil Science</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJPSS_98591</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Effect of gypsum and foliar application of zinc on growth and yield of groundnut (<i>Arachis hypogaea</i> L.)</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### **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 1.7**

**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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>The research is interesting even if not very innovative but the manuscript needs to be improved</b></li> <li>2. <b>Yes</b></li> <li>3. <b>Needs to be improved</b></li> <li>4. <b>Yes</b></li> <li>5. <b>yes, but it needs to be improved</b></li> <li>6. <b>No, they are not sufficient .</b></li> </ol>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>It needs to be improved</b></li> </ol>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>The authors of the paper "Effect of gypsum and foliar application of zinc on growth and yield of groundnut (Arachis hypogaea L.)" evaluated the effect of some fertilizers on the qualitative and quantitative parameters of groundnut. The research topic is not very innovative and the manuscript needs major revisions before being ready for publication.</p> <p>Abstract:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- It is suggested to rewrite this section by mentioning the analyzes carried out to verify the different theses.</li> <li>- If the authors also want to include aims in this paragraph, it is advisable not to repeat the entire title.</li> <li>- Some keywords are too general. Replace "growth" and "yield" with words more relevant to your research topic.</li> </ul> <p>Introduction:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- This part of the manuscript needs several revisions. If the authors have up-to-date groundnut cropping area data, could include it.</li> <li>- Almost all the concepts reported have no bibliographic references. They must necessarily be insert.</li> <li>- To improve the quality of the manuscript, references to research activities in which foliar fertilization has been used could be reported.</li> <li>- Furthermore, what do the authors mean by "To work out the economics of different treatment combinations"?. It is not clear.</li> </ul> <p>Materials and methods</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- In this paragraph, more details concerning the methods used for soil analyses, sampling, experimental design used (size of the blocks and n. of plants) and foliar fertilization are needed.</li> <li>- If the authors have nitrogen data and C/N ratio, they could include it.</li> </ul> <p>This information would help to better understand some dynamics.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Autors refer to economic analysis. It should be more detailed. Were indexes used? The term</li> </ul>	

**Review Form 1.7**

	<p>"economic analysis" may not be very correct.</p> <p>Results and discussions</p> <p>Growth parameters - Plant height (cm)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- What do the authors mean by "where primary growth elephant was available in sufficient amount"?</li> <li>- The authors argue that "Foliar spraying with zinc encouraged the vegetative growth and increased the plant capacity for building metabolites".</li> </ul> <p>If there are no results in favor of this explanation, a bibliographic reference should be included.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Also the formatting of the bibliographic references is wrong. The year of publication is missing.</li> </ul> <p>Dry weight of plant (g)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- "The Data indicated that, groundnut at 60 DAS". Please explain this sentence better. It's not very clear.</li> <li>- "Such response may be due to that zinc is known to play an activator of several enzymes in plants and is directly involved in the biosynthesis of growth substances such as auxin which produces more plant cells and more dry matter. Similar results were obtained by Darwish et al., Tomar et al., Malewar et al., Tripathy et al., and Shankar et al". This sentence was written several times in the manuscript. Find another explanation.</li> </ul> <p>Yield parameters - Number of pods per plant</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The data are reported in table 4. Why the authors write "is reported in a table for in general".</li> <li>- "Gypsum 400 kg/ha + Zinc 4000 ppm. recorded maximum number of pods" remove the point after ppm.</li> <li>- In this paragraph, as well as in the following one, the discussion supported by bibliographic references is missing.</li> </ul> <p>Yield - Seed Yield (t/ha)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Authors should indicate where data were presented (Table 4 ?)</li> <li>- The value of the "seed yield" relating to the treatment with Gypsum 400 kg/ha + Zinc 4000 ppm present in the text does not match the one in the table. Please check .</li> <li>- About "Haulm yield" (t/ha), use the same name in the text and in the table.</li> </ul> <p>Harvest Index (%)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Authors should try to give different explanations and avoid repeating themselves.</li> </ul> <p>Conclusions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- This paragraph should be rewritten. It is obvious and repeats concepts already expressed.</li> </ul> <p>Minor comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The tables lack standard deviation and letters relating to the statistical analysis.</li> <li>- All abbreviations should be written in full.</li> <li>- Review the formatting of bibliographic references.</li> </ul>	
--	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Francesco De Mastro</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Bari "Aldo Moro", Italy</b>