

## Review Form 1.7

|                          |  |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name:            | <b>International Journal of Plant &amp; Soil Science</b>   |
| Manuscript Number:       | <b>Ms_IJPSS_99207</b>  |
| Title of the Manuscript: | <b>Vertical distribution of DTPA extractable micronutrients in two distinct soils of Central India under diverse land-uses</b> |
| Type of the Article      | <b>Original Research Article</b>   |

### 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) |
|---|--|---|
| <b>Compulsory REVISION</b> comments<br>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b><br>(Please write few sentences on this manuscript)<br>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b><br>(If not please suggest an alternative title)<br>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b><br>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b><br>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b><br>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b><br><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b> | 1. I suggest the authors to include more cites of researchers in the field related to micronutrient content in soil and comparing that research with their discussion performed in their study. I strongly recommend the review of different literature scientific research. Moreover, I think the authors must expand their introduction, discussion, and conclusion sections accordingly with new literature review that might strengthen their investigation.<br>2. Yes<br>3. Yes<br>4. Yes<br>5. Yes<br>6. Yes, although I suggest the authors to cite more articles to strengthen their findings. |   |
| <b>Minor REVISION</b> comments<br>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>   | None. I think the manuscript is well written and has not typo or redaction errors  |   |
| <b>Optional/General</b> comments  | I suggest the authors cite more articles related with the methodology they performed; and latter get a better understanding of the conclusions they found in their manuscript, discussing them with more details.  |   |

### 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) |
|---|---|---|
| <b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b> | (If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details) |   |

### Reviewer Details:

|                                  |  |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Name:                            | <b>Jorge Octavio Virues Delgadillo</b> |
| Department, University & Country | <b>Universidad Veracruzana, México</b> |