

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_105958
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of planting date on growth and yield of potato (Solanum tuberosum 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)
<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? 5.</p> <p>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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. The manuscript is important for the scientist communication. However, there is a lack of profound research information on potatoes studies from international, regional and local studies.</p> <p>2. The title of the study is not sufficient, since there was no mention of the country of the study or the province. Eg The effect of planting dates on potato productivity under rain-fed /humid: India</p> <p>3. The abstract lacks key indicators such as the statistical outputs when comparing data from different planting dates. There are no comparisons. It is just a summary of the findings. Rephrase the second sentence on the abstract. That poor scientific writing.</p> <p>4. The structure of the manuscript is acceptable but has no numbering structure. The introduction part has only 4 references (poor reading by the author). A plethora of studies on potatoes are available globally. There was no reference on the planting dates by other scientist. This section has to be beefed up. What determines the suitable planting dates? What were the environmental conditions that guided the most suitable planting dates? There was no mention of degree days or thermal temperatures, what are the water requirements? Was it under irrigation or dry land?</p> <p>1st sentence under abstract and Sub-title The Field Experiment is repetition, no reference on Timely Planting Date, Some Acronyms are not described, and others described but never referred to. The writing seems to be a report rather than a scientific manuscript. Check spacing on page 3. There is very poor interpretation and writing of results.</p> <p>5. The manuscript could be improved to international standards. The content is relevant, but needs a lot of literature reading. The author has to improve the writing abilities and terminology.</p> <p>6. The references are insufficient, it remains the responsibility of the author to search for the references, Visit Science Direct, Google Scholar and your local library</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>There is a room for improvement in English command</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The paper needs serious revision, references needs to be improved, scientific writing has to be improved and the statistical analysis is very poor. Based on the collected data, this manuscript could be one of the best within the scope of potato production.</p>	

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:	Gugulethu Zuma-Netshiukhwi
Department, University & Country	South Africa