

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Original Manuscript_IJPSS_117966
Title of the Manuscript:	Yield, nutrient content and their uptake by groundnut (<i>Arachis hypogaea</i> L.) as affected by sulphur and planting methods in coarse textured soil of south-west Haryana
Type of the Article	

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. Yes, the manuscript is relevant to the scientific community. The authors used standardized and reproducible methods to test two groundnut cultivation variables (sulphur concentration and planting method). They obtained results that will impact the plant and soil sciences area.</p> <p>2. The title reflects what the authors approach, so it is appropriate.</p> <p>3. The summary clearly and objectively contextualizes points of the introduction and methodology and prioritizes the results obtained.</p> <p>4. The manuscript is well structured, and all topics are covered with appropriate content. However, it seems that at the end of the introduction the connection with the methodology was left vague due to the lack of an objective (it was included as a suggestion in the comments). I also suggest that the statistical analysis part needs to be better developed with which tests were used (what the author calls "proper methods").</p> <p>The way of writing in relation to the significance of the results also needs greater review and care (see comments in the results and discussion section).</p> <p>5. I believe the article is scientifically correct, however it is necessary to provide the information I mentioned in topic 4.</p> <p>6. I believe that the references are sufficient, but the introduction has moments where information is given without a reference, and it is necessary for the author to review the need for citations in these excerpts.</p> <p>There are works that the author can explore further in the results and discussion topic (see comments in the section Results and Discussion)</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>1. I noticed that throughout the article the authors write in both British and American English. If there is a need for standardization on the part of the journal, I believe it is important to communicate to the authors. In addition, there are some suggestions for changing the writing and comma corrections, among others throughout the text.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The authors do a good job and have original results when presenting their results of the analysis of different sulphur treatments under different growing conditions of groundnut (<i>Arachis hypogaea</i> L.) in the south-western region of Haryana, India.</p> <p>Although, I have some recommendations:</p> <p>I consider that the excerpts that state affirmations that are not those results found on the study need to be referenced. Beyond that, they should provide more information about the statistical analysis method. What method was used? It is also necessary to check how the "significance" word appears in the results.</p> <p>I strongly recommend further exploration of the works cited in the "results and discussion" in a way that correlates with the results found (effectively conducting a discussion).</p> <p>The writing of the article, while not bad, is difficult to follow in places. Many short sentences overlap in content. Other comments and suggestions are marked in the manuscript.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

	Finally, I consider that the manuscript needs to undergo to Major Revision before being accepted.	
--	---	--

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:	Lara Serpa Jaegge Deccache
Department, University & Country	Instituto de Pesquisas Jardim Botânico do Rio de Janeiro, Brazil