

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_95755
Title of the Manuscript:	NUTRIENT UPTAKE AND YIELD ATTRIBUTES OF CONTAINER GROWN ELEPHANT FOOT YAM AS INFLUENCED BY GROWTH MEDIUM, NUTRIENT SCHEDULE AND IRRIGATION SCHEDULE
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)
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)	Absolutely. I understand that all experimental information can be useful for future scientific and industrial work. In addition, producers can find here important information to schedule the next harvest. Yes, I do. Yes, it is very clear. Yes, the text is correctly structured. Yes, I do. I consider that the references presented are sufficient and up to date. I was very pleased with the inclusion of graphics. Charts are an important tool to help understand data.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	In general terms, yes. But there are various cases of double space between words and a few errors of agreement. I suggest that the Author perform a complete review of the text.	
Optional/General comments	No 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:	Alexandre Ricardo Pereira Schuler
Department, University & Country	Universidade Federal de Pernambuco, Brasil