

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_95045
Title of the Manuscript:	Physico-chemical properties of cotton growing soils in Uppununthala mandal, Nagarkurnool district, Telangana
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>)

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 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. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	1. The subject of the present paper is very interesting for readers because the limited availability of soil resources for agriculture diminishes and optimize the use of nutrients with intensification of agriculture which results in the rapid depletion of the nutrients. 2. Yes, the title is suitable for the present article. 3. The abstract is comprehensive (contains the relevant obtained results). 4. The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate. 5. The text is clear and easy to read; the introduction provides enough background; the literature consulted are well discussed. 6. The reference list could be improved.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications.	
Optional/General comments	Is not case.	

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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Dumitru Gabriela
Department, University & Country	Alexandru Ioan Cuza University of Iasi, Romania