

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_98120
Title of the Manuscript:	The nutrient magnesium in soil and plant - A review
Type of the Article	Review 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)	1. The manuscript aims to review the literature on magnesium. However, it has a more didactic than scientific character, with very little relevant information for the advancement of research with this element.	
2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	2. No. The title suggests that it is a literature review, and the body of the text does not convey this assumption.	
3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?	3. Yes. The abstract is comprehensive	
4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	4. The text divisions are comprehensive; the biggest problem is the lack of information from recent works, and the superficiality of the approach.	
5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?	5. Yes. The basic information is correct. There is a superficial explanation of the phenomena, but with a very didactic character.	
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)	6. No. The lack of references is the most sensitive point of the work. It does not reach the minimum established by the journal for a review job.	
Minor REVISION comments		
1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	It could be better written, however the language is easily understandable	
Optional/General comments	The idea of the manuscript is good; there is a lack of texts compiling information regarding nutrients in different approaches. However, the manuscript covers the topics very superficially, and there is a lack of current references.	

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:	Rodolfo Soares de Almeida
Department, University & Country	Federal University of Viçosa, Brazil