

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)	1. Yes, it is, given the fact that its about food that can be grown all over the place. 2. The title is comprehensive, but my suggestion is not to use twice the same word – "NUTRIENT UPTAKE AND YIELD ATTRIBUTES OF CONTAINER GROWN ELEPHANT FOOT YAM, AS INFLUENCED BY GROWTH MEDIUM, NUTRIENTS AND IRRIGATION SCHEDULE" 3. Abstract ok. Please explain what in FYM (farmyard manure), so the text to be easily understood by all the readers. 4. Too short introduction, with no citations – please rewrite this section. For "Materials and Method" use smaller paragraph, its very hard to understand the text. 5. Yes, it seems to be. In order to be more accurate, please explain why did you used different MAP scales in figures? In Fig. 1 and 2 you have MAP from 1-6, in Fig. 3 MAP is 2-7, while in Fig. 4 there is a mix, from 2-3 to 6-7. 6. Not enough references and really old papers, nothing up to date. Please see the literature again and choose some interesting articles to cite. I found on the Internet really interesting research papers, on similar subjects.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	English is all right, but please check the entire text, especially for additional spaces.	
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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Horoias Roxana
Department, University & Country	University of Agronomic Sciences and Veterinary Medicine, Romania