

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_99329
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Different Spacing and Varieties on Growth, Quality and Yield in Onion (<i>Allium cepa</i> 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)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The abstract section does not yet display the problem formulation which is the initial idea of the research The introductory section has not been able to describe the formulation of the problem according to the title. The title emphasizes ideas related to spacing and varieties, but in the introduction it emphasizes function and content more. The introductory section is also only one paragraph, the paragraphs are quite long. in discussing, don't just describe the data, moreover it has been presented in tables. Must be able to provide an analysis of the data obtained. The discussion must also be compared with the characteristics of the varieties used, because each variety has its own characteristics in discussing, why not provide an analysis of the side of irradiation and competition in getting nutrition? the reference has not used the Mendeley application <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the references used are very old, preferably using the last 5-10 years 	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	if the name is latin it should be in italics	
Optional/General comments	the discussion is rewritten by providing analysis on the data obtained and not just describing. In discussing, try to give an analysis from the side of irradiation adequacy, competition in getting nutrition and compare it with the characteristics of each variety.	

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:	I Nengah Muliarta
Department, University & Country	Warmadewa University, Indonesia