

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_104043
Title of the Manuscript:	Chemical and biological properties of soil affected by biofertilizer based nutrient management
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>)

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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. Yes.</p> <p>2. Yes.</p> <p>3. No. I suggest that the abstract not start with the title of the manuscript because it is redundant and uninteresting to those who read. A more direct summary pattern is more appropriate and representative. It is not necessary to repeat details of the method in the summary, it needs to be improved.</p> <p>4. Yes.</p> <p>5. Yes. It presents a concise and reproducible methodology.</p> <p>6. Yes. But the references need to be reviewed both in the specific section and in the citations throughout the text. The references are not in accordance with the standards of the journal.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>I suggest that a thorough review of the writing be carried out. In line 9 of the introduction, we observe the presence of repeated words. The text needs to be reviewed for grammar and spelling as well.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>I recommend that other keywords other than those contained in the title be used to facilitate the finding of the manuscript in search engines. Include, for example: soil improvement.</p> <p>In topic 3.1.2 there is no reasoned discussion, only a comparative analysis. It is necessary to better describe the correlation between the studies since the cultivar analysed was different. What would be the possible interferents to obtain the same result?</p> <p>The conclusions are described as results, I suggest they be reassessed. The content can be transferred to the Results and Discussion section. This should briefly state the major findings of the study.</p> <p>The format of the tables is incorrect, data was displayed in frame form and titled as tables. Need to review.</p>	

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

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ohana Luiza Santos de Oliveira
Department, University & Country	UniFTC University Center, Brazil