

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Plant &amp; Soil Science</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJPSS_103552</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Effect of Date of Sowing and INM (Integrated Nitrogen Management) on Yield and Economics of Summer Groundnut (Arachis hypogaea L.)</b>
Type of the 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**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>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)</b>
<b>Compulsory REVISION comments</b>  <b>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)  <b>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)  <b>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b>  <b>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>  <b>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b>  <b>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b>  <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	<p>The manuscript would have been important when the introduction is well contextualized to the topic.</p> <p>This can only be properly crafted when the aims or objectives of a study are clear. It should be remembered that the abbreviation usually comes after the full word.</p> <p>The abstract is full of abbreviations and not well written. I do not see the mean values although the authors claim to have replicated their experiments.</p> <p>This manuscript is not well structured. The connection between the different sections is rather difficult.</p> <p>Scientifically, such a manuscript is not allowed because it makes replication of the experiment very difficult.</p> <p>References are not sufficient in the introduction and discussion as well.</p> <p>There is no evidence of replication of the experiment in the manuscript. How data was analysed is unclear and it seems the results are of raw data.</p>	
<b>Minor REVISION comments</b>  <b>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	A lot of improvement is required.	
<b>Optional/General comments</b>		

### **PART 2:**

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

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Opio Alfonse</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Gulu University, Uganda</b>