

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_93040
Title of the Manuscript:	STATUS OF NITROGEN POOLS UNDER IMPORTANT CROPPING SYSTEMS IN INCEPTISOLS AND VERTISOLS OF NORTHERN TELANGANA ZONE
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	Not necessary	
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Put the name of the country on the title. 2. Related to title and objectives of the study, mention or explain concisely the meaning of 'important cropping systems' in the study. 3. Mention in conclusion the result of the study on microbial processes in C&N transformation in soil. 4. Show clearly the explanation for Figure 2. 5. Table on first para of 4.3.1. is Table 1 Or Table 2 ? Table 1 doesn't contain any information on N content in soil. 6. Put Table 2 right after the first paragraph in 4.3.1. Available – Nitrogen. 7. References <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Some authors such as: Schmied <i>et al.</i>, 2000; Bremner, 1965; Agehara and Warncke, 2005 and Santhy <i>et al.</i> 1998, are in paper but not on the list of references. Conversely, Stone and Buttery (1989) is on the list of references but not in paper. b. Whitting, G. J. & Chanton, J. P. 2001 is written twice. c. Not fully written alphabetically. 8. Correct some typhos in paper. 	
Optional/General comments	After some corrections, the paper is good enough to be published.	

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)	

Review Form 1.6

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Iman Santosa
Department, University & Country	Indonesian Environmental Scientists Association (IESA), Indonesia