

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_106097
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of spacing and foliar spray of liquid organic manures on Yield and Economics of zaid groundnut (Arachis hypogea)
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> <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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. I reviewed the article entitled "Effect of spacing and foliar spray of liquid organic manures on Yield and Economics of zaid groundnut (<i>Arachis hypogea</i>)" which is interesting, relevant and contains some novelty. I had no problem reviewing this article as I believe the authors have done the research that led to some results to add to the existing body of knowledge on the subject. More importantly, it will certainly guide further research in this field on the effective use of liquid fertilizers to improve the yield and economics of groundnut (<i>Arachis hypogea</i>).</p> <p>2. The title of the article is appropriate.</p> <p>3. The abstract of the article is comprehensive.</p> <p>4. The structure of the manuscript is appropriate and contains the necessary sections.</p> <p>5. The manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>6. The list of used literary sources is somewhat concise, contains few new references. It is necessary to expand it and add new, fresh foreign references to the research topic.</p> <p>7. The purpose of the research should be clearly stated at the end of the literature review</p> <p>8. In the methodology, it is necessary to indicate the chemical composition of liquid organic fertilizers used in research, the content of the main nutrients in them. And also when and how they were applied.</p> <p>9. It should also be indicated which mineral fertilizers were used during the control and when they were applied.</p> <p>10. It is necessary to indicate the methods and regulatory documents by means of which the studied indicators are determined.</p> <p>11. In the section "RESULTS AND THEIR DISCUSSION" when describing the obtained results, only the obtained values are given. There are practically no explanations or discussions. Therefore, the analysis of the obtained research results needs to be expanded and supplemented</p> <p>12. The conclusion presented in the article is too simple, it needs to be expanded, filled with the received data.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language of the article is suitable for scientific communications.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The article presents the results of one-year studies obtained during the Rabi season of 2022. How appropriate is it to highlight the results of one-year research, or is it better to conduct research for another 1-2 years, and then draw conclusions. The editors of the journal must decide whether it is correct and permissible to publish the results of one-year studies. In our country, articles are published with the results of two or three years of research, based on which certain conclusions and recommendations can already be made. In my opinion, the article deserves to be published after revision.</p>	

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

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Olifir Yurii
Department, University & Country	Institute of Agriculture of Carpathian Region, National Academy of Agrarian Sciences, Ukraine