

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_98999
Title of the Manuscript:	Watering rates and its response to Cocoa (Theobroma Cacao L.) Genotypes growth development.
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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The manuscript might be useful for scientific community from countries with the same ecological conditions, regarding the seedling production of cocoa in the nursery. 2. I suggest an alternative (more suitable) title for this article: Effect of Watering Rate on Growth Development of Cocoa (<i>Theobroma Cacao</i> L.) Genotypes in the Nursery. 3. The abstract must be improved. 4. Subsections and structure of the manuscript can be considered as appropriate. 5. The scientific aspect of the manuscript must be improved. 6. The references are appropriate, considering that 17 from 34 titles are from last 10 years. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>Minor changes are needed, especially regarding the presentation of the results.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The article include a lot o data regarding the value of different growth parameters under different watering rates during different weeks after sowing. From a scientific/statistic point of view the results could be used more effectively (obtaining more edifying results) by analyzing the data according to a two- (split-plot) or three-factor (split-split-plot) model. - Remove p>0.05 from abstract. Insert space between value and unit for watering rate (50 ml; 100 ml; 150 ml) and other data (25 cm; 26.53 cm; and so on), in the whole article. - In the Introduction section reformulate the aim of the research as follows: The present study was therefore proposed to identify a probable rate of watering on the CRIN Cocoa and F3 Amazon hybrids morphological growth, root enhancement and biomass development to promote water conservation in the nursery stage of cocoa production. - Considering that in the M&M you stated that „...data collected were subjected to Analysis of Variance...” you have to insert the results of ANOVA in the Results and Discussion section. - Remove p>0.05 from the text of Results and Discussion section. - In order to make statistical comparisons between the effects of watering rates on each genotype the experience had to be organized according to a split plot design. In this regard the conclusion “The application of the 3 watering levels 50ml, 100ml and 150ml didn't make any considerable difference on the emergence of the cocoa CRINTc 1-8 genotypes and the F3 Amazon, though 50ml watering rate had more 100% emergence followed by 100ml and 150ml who had same but lesser occurrence of 100% emergence than when 50ml watering rate was applied after 4 weeks.” Has no real/statistical basis. The increase of watering rate has had positive effect in some genotype and negative for others. - In the conclusions you have to add more clear information which highlights the scientific value of the 	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

	obtained results.	
--	-------------------	--

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Adriana Ciulca
Department, University & Country	Life Sciences University, Romania