

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Soil Science and Plant Nutrition
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJSSPN_96767
Title of the Manuscript:	Enhancing drought tolerance of quinoa (<i>Chenopodium quinoa</i>) through potassium and boron application
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.journalajsspn.com/index.php/AJSSPN/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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	1. The manuscript is very good for the scientific community since it explains new and innovative ways to increase crop yield even under drought stressed condition. Again, as climate change increases, this research will give farmers techniques to produce their crop and still meet optimum yield. 2. The title is okay 3. The abstract is being well written but results from the potassium (K) was presented neglecting the boron (B) treatment. Again, results of other parameters should have been talked about briefly in the abstract. 4. The structure of the manuscript was okay but the author should compare his RESULTS with other literature so as to make a better justification of the work. 5. Yes, the manuscript is scientifically correct. 6. There are some references which were not found in the reference list and vice versa. Again, the author should try to reference more of those works he/she borrowed ideas from. Referencing less than twenty works for scientific writing is very low. Generally, the work will contribute to the scientific world. Authors should be entreated to adhere to all the comments and corrections given.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, the language used is suitable for scholarly communications.	
Optional/General 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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Shadrack Asomah
Department, University & Country	University of Energy and Natural Resources, Ghana