

Review Form 1.7

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name: | International Journal of Plant & Soil Science |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_IJPSS_96942 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Regulated dry season irrigation effects on tree water use, root zone moisture dynamics and yield of cacao in a rainforest zone of Nigeria |
| Type of the 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>)

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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The manuscript could be important for the scientific community to bring in an intervention that will lead to improvement in the economy of both individual and a country, generation of strategies to overcome effects of climate change as well as increasing production of products and management and protection of the environment. The title appears to be ok as it appears to be concise and descriptive. However, in failing to understand the objective of the study which is not coming out clearly though, I consider it to be long. I would, therefore, propose a small change, a swapping of a word or two as follows “ The Effects of regulated dry season irrigation on tree water use, root zone moisture dynamics and yield of cacao in a rainforest zone of Nigeria” The abstract appears to be lacking some tangible facts like a summary of the findings, challenges and proposed way forward, just to mention a few. An abstract is supposed to be a shorter version of the main report. It is, however, not supposed to be a copy and paste from the other sections. The structure of the manuscript appears to be a traditional one with a strange section between the Conclusion and Reference sections though, Highlights. I would recommend that this important information be placed in the Abstract or Conclusion sections as it appears not to be in order. The traditional section on Acknowledgement is missing but I take it to be a minor one and it will be considered after finalising the review I guess. I would, however, just want to propose an inclusion of a section on the challenges and the proposed way forward. If they cannot be a section or sections on their own, the information could be included in the Conclusion Section. Basing on the data and facts presented, I feel it's scientifically correct. Some facts presented were observed to be difficult to tell/establish the message and there are some facts that need to be backed with facts and data to make an informed judgement. Avoid repetition of facts. Comments in track changes of the document may help the author in some cases. Note that some of the facts presented in the document need to be backed by references and this has been mentioned in the track changes of the document. Not all references on the list have been used in the document. Only 32 of the total 40 appear in the document. Those used in the document but not on the list of references are 6 and these are: UFCCC, 2004; IPCC, 2014; Trenberth et al, 2014; Grayson, 2013; Yang et al, 2002 and Moset et al., 2010 and those not appearing are numbers 14, 20, 21 and 32. Dates indicated in the document tend to be different from those indicated in the Reference list and these reference numbers 11 and 20. <p>Reference number 30 of Penman HL is of 1948 and appears to be outdated. Any possibility of getting a revised/latest one if possible and available?</p> <p>Table 1 and Figures 1 to 7 need to be placed in the main document and closer to where they have been introduced for easy referencing. Illustrations that include Tables and Figures are the most efficient way to present your results. In addition, not all figures are relevant as such; you may consider only those that are crucial for this presentation. Remember that a figure is worth a thousand words. Avoid long titles for the Figures and Table in the document.</p> <p>Paragraphs in Sections on Introduction, Materials and Methods and Results and Discussion are un</p> | |

Review Form 1.7

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| | <p>necessarily long and wordy. Long paragraphs put readers off to read and try to get the message. Consider summarising the information contained in the paragraphs and making short paragraphs for one to easily follow.</p> <p>Tests conducted on the sampled soil samples are not coming out clearly in the report. This include the method of analysis.</p> <p>Consider adding a section on the challenges and proposed way forward to the report.</p> <p>All the abbreviations/acronyms/symbols should be written in full followed by the abbreviations/acronyms themselves when they appear in the document for the first time, thereafter, the abbreviations/acronyms/symbols can be used.</p> <p>Avoid making sentences that are not connecting very well as observed in Sections and sub-sections as well as repetition of facts which has been observed to be common especially in the Introduction Section (see my comments in track changes).</p> <p>Consider numbering all the Sections including the references for easy referencing.</p> | |
| <p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p> | <p>The answer could be no as well as yes and comments have been made to this regard. Please refer to the comments in track changes. Consider using words or phrases that are scientifically and professionally correct.</p> <p>Proofreading of the whole document to correct the grammar, typos, tenses, font type, font size etc including rephrasing/reconstruction of some sentences as well as taking out repeated statements</p> | |
| <p>Optional/General comments</p> | <p>Consider reviewing the titles of the Table and Figures as they are un necessarily long and confusing at times.</p> <p>The conclusion part is observed to be too shallow and needs to be reviewed. It should be consistent with what has been provided in the whole document. It is not supposed to be a copy and paste of what is in the Results and Discussion sections but rather a summary of the findings which is also supposed to be part of the Abstract.</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) |
| <p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p> | <p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p> | |

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|----------------------------------|----------------------------|
| Name: | James Peaches Phiri |
| Department, University & Country | Malawi |