

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_97152
Title of the Manuscript:	"Effect of Irrigation Scheduling and Foliar Organic Nutrition on growth and yield of Summer Groundnut (Arachis hypogaea 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>)

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)	Yes, the manuscript contains valuable information for the scientific community and for farmers who produce Summer Groundnut Yes A conclusion is needed that highlights the results of the study Yes Yes No, they are not enough, they do not include references in the introduction and they only mention authors in the discussion but do not tell us about their contributions or contributions to the research In addition, the way of citing them is not correct, neither in the text nor in the list of references. Many of the citations in the reference list are not in the text.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Requires review	
Optional/General comments	I believe that it is necessary to develop the discussion further, mention what were the findings of the authors they cite and what are the similarities or differences found with respect to their research. A review of the writing and references is also needed	

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)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ruth Noemí Aguila Ramírez
Department, University & Country	Instituto Politécnico Nacional, México