

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_120870
Title of the Manuscript:	Dry matter accumulation and biomass partitioning of groundnut (<i>Arachis hypogaea</i> L.) as influenced by sulphur levels and genotypes
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript is indeed relevant to the scientific community but still needs to undergo some major revision for its acceptance and publication to the wider scientific audience. The manuscript contains a lot of scientific inconsistencies and discontinuities that need to be addressed by the author(s) for another review.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is okay and may not require any further modifications.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract of the article is not comprehensive. It lacks a brief background of topic, aim of study, analytical methods, conclusion and recommendations.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The subsections and structure of the manuscript have some inappropriateness. It has some relevant subsections/subheading that could still be included based on the generating a background on the study topic.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript may still require some quality checks during another review before it can qualify as a full-length paper. The results section is not robust and the discussion is weak. There seems to be some issues with factual corroboration in the manuscript. However, if it fits the journal to accept it for publication, then I am suggesting that it should be accepted as a "Short Communication".	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are somehow recent with the exception of one, and they are not sufficient. The number of references is scanty. This could be the reason why the author(s) could not have been able to present a good discussion of findings obtained in this study.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language quality of the article has some issues. There is so much use of ambiguous words with so many grammatical errors and discontinuities in several cases. This manuscript requires thorough English editing.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The author(s) need(s) to justify the statistical test they conducted to ascertain the significance of the results. ○ Too many ambiguous words such as disquisition, inquisition, perusal, ○ The author(s) should be advised to use table for presentation of their results and figures to discuss their findings. ○ This is an agronomic experiment and therefore the author(s) need(s) to give a detailed agronomic background of the study area albeit the full literature review, which can strengthen the quality of the article. ○ The discussion is completely missing in this manuscript. The Journal needs to make sure that the findings are properly discussed and referenced. 	

Review Form 3

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:	Denis M.K. Amara
Department, University & Country	Njala University, Sierra Leone