

Review Form 1.7

Pa

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_101835
Title of the Manuscript:	“Influence of Seaweed Sap and Zinc on growth and yield of Baby corn (Zea mays L.)”
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>)

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> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>No</p> <p>No</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	No	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Abstract:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The abstract is not okay: For example, it does not give reader the problem statement. I expected to see at most two sentences in the paper that outlines/highlights problem being solved. 2) Secondly, there is nowhere in the abstract that a the authors are explaining the method they are using to analyse the data. 3) I also do not like the first sentence as it has citation which is a rare thing in abstract. <p>Introduction:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Inconsistencies in wording: What is the difference between babycorn and baby corn? 2) Re-read and improve the grammar in the sentence “Farmers are becoming more interested in baby production due to its low production costs, high domestic demand, promising market, potential value addition, support for the domestic economy and higher revenue Sale et al. (2022)”. For example, what is baby production? 3) The following sentence has poor grammar in relation to other sentences: “While Uttar Pradesh gives an area of approximately 0.73 million hectares with a 7.98% to the entire country of India, which has a production of approximately 1.53 million (Agricultural Statistics at a Glance, 2019).” For example, how can you begin a sentence using the word while? 4) The following sentence is starting with lower case: “ zinc is major component and activator of several enzymes involved in metabolic activities, its deficiency continues to be one of the key factors in determining rice production in several parts of country (Muthukumararaja and Sriramachandrasekharan 2012).” 	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>5) Generally the introduction is lacking in rigorous review of literature; motivation statement; and a paragraph research questions. You can read the following paper to help you to write the paper properly: Chidzalo, P., Ngare, P. O., & Mung'atu, J. K. (2022). Trivariate Stochastic Weather Model for Predicting Maize Yield. <i>Journal of Applied Mathematics</i>, 2022.</p> <p>6) Please make sure that the introduction has literature review; identification of research questions; motivation statement; and also a paragraph introducing the rest of the paper. I have given you a paper for you to read its introduction so that you can see how to improve the paper.</p> <p>METHODOLOGY</p> <p>7) The methodology is too narrow. I expected the following: i) A diagram showing the research design that the author adopted ii) together with methodology for example some analysis of variance (ANOVA/ANCOVA) for the author to compare the treatments iii) Assumptions; for example interactions considered in the model that the author choses. I also expect the author to state the actual person who conducted the experiment: Is it the author or another institution?</p> <p>8) This is serious work and the author should be willing to provide serious evidence from the data.</p> <p>RESULTS SECTION</p> <p>9) I expected the authors to present the results in an interesting way: For example how did the authors know that growth rate was good. I suggest that the author should show a separate analysis for each parameter to show how the treatment 9 was different from the rest.</p> <p>10) I also expected graphical presentation for interactions among the data collected; yield growth with progress in season.</p> <p>11) Check the spelling errors in the paper: for example "RESULT AND DISSCUSSION". There are many spelling errors elsewhere.</p> <p>CONCLUSION</p> <p>12) The conclusion is not rigorous given that the introduction; and methodology are not well written.</p> <p>I recommend that the paper needs serious major revisions</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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Patrick Chidzalo
Department, University & Country	Malawi University of Science and Technology, Malawi