

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 (Solanum lycopersicon 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"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. 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>The title is not adequate. This is because there are other treatments: farmyard manure, RDF (this was not defined in the manuscript), varied amounts of silicon supplementation and percentages of silicon. The author needs to integrate into the title. Its not, No statement of problem(s), no methodologies and statistical analyses. Abstract is usually a paragraph. They are not appropriate and logical. No evidence of literature review in the introduction. Facts were not referenced. No single reference cited in introduction. The aim was wrongly placed in paragraph 2 rather than the end of introduction. Methodology not explicit, results not well presented and results not well discussed. May be if the manuscript is better presented. His proof as to the importance of silicon is not logical and correct The references are not sufficient and adequate. References are old, no 2020's. The cited references were not all referenced.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>The paper needs serious editorial work</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The paper requires total revision.</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:	P.O.Fatoba
Department, University & Country	University of Ilorin, Nigeria