

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>)

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>1. The objectives and the rationale of the study clearly stated. The manuscript is concise, well written and scientifically sound.</p> <p>2. Title: The following is a suggested title. "Watering rates and their response to growth development of cocoa (Theobroma Cacao L.) genotypes."</p> <p>3. Abstract: Very clear.</p> <p>4. The structure of the manuscript is appropriate.</p> <p>5. The manuscript is concise, well written with clear objectives, scientifically sound and the experimental plan has been sufficient developed, therefore, worth publishing.</p> <p>6. The references are sufficient but need more recent ones.</p> <p>Suggestions To increase the utility of the paper to readers, the following are my suggestions.</p> <p>1. Basic information about the soil type and characteristic.</p> <p>2. Further information about the the nursery house i.e., nursery house type and the atmospheric condition under which the experiment was conducted.</p> <p>3. Information about water source is important to be stated in the study.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	NA	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	Addition of subheadings for materials and methods, results and discussion.	

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

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Tsekwi Gracious Rinwi
Department, University & Country	South China University of Technology, China