

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Plant &amp; Soil Science</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJPSS_102956</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Impact of TNAU-Water Soluble Fertilizers on Soil Nutrient Availability, Nutrient Content and Bulb Quality of Small Onion (<i>Allium cepa</i> var. <i>aggregatum</i>)</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>	<p><b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> It is very important to the scientific world as well as farming communities and small onion quality is paramount.</p> <p><b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> The title of the article is suitable.</p> <p><b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b> The abstract of the article is comprehensive but should consider adhering to the suggestions made.</p> <p><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b> The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate but lack explanations of the author as to why the results are like this. The introduction needs to be considered for more literature review.</p> <p><b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The manuscript is scientifically correct because of its nature and references cited and listed.</li> <li>▪ The statistics is not clear. If P=0.05 can 0.1 or 0.2 be significant?</li> <li>▪ The tables need to have a row showing mean values and some tables are not necessary.</li> <li>▪ <b>I encourage the author(s) to critically list the references in alphabetical order regardless of what.</b></li> </ul>	
<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>	Yes	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>This is a important manuscript but the author(s) need to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Bring in their views</li> <li>▪ Remove all old references apart from the originals</li> <li>▪ Improve on the tables to look scientific</li> </ul>	

### 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><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	<b>Felix Mereka Chipojola</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Malawi</b>