

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_118892
Title of the Manuscript:	"A Study on the Influence of Silicon Supplementation on Yield Attributes of Tomato (<i>Solanum lycopersicon</i> Mill.) Var. SL-12"
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

	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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Yes, the topic is of interest as it contributes to global food security and minimal use of synthetic agro-chemical.</p> <p>Yes, it can be shortened to something like, "Silicon effects on tomato (<i>Solanum lycopersicon</i> Mill.) yield attributes". Adding the name of the variety seems to limit the applicability of the research unnecessarily.</p> <p>Yes, abstract is comprehensive but can be improved by further summarisation and removing the paragraphs and undefined abbreviations. Somewhat, but additional subsections can help improve the structure and logical flow of the paper.</p> <p>Yes, but the author can improve the article by making the connections between its findings and those in literature more explicit.</p> <p>The references cited in the actual manuscript are insufficient. The author makes statements/claims that are not supported by literature when they should be.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 		
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The author should have given a deeper background on the connection between Diatomaceous earth (DE) and silicon supplements for agricultural use. Also, there should have been a more detailed treatment of the interactions and pathways between silicon and other nutrients such as NPK leading to improved yield outcomes. The discussion of the results is too generic and fuzzy.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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:	Batanai Lovemore Sammie
Department, University & Country	Midlands State University, Zimbabwe