

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Plant &amp; Soil Science</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJPSS_104911</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Effect of Different Phosphorus Sources on Soil Physico-Chemical Property Dynamics under Chickpea Crop</b>
Type of the 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**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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</b> REVISION comments  <b>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)  <b>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)  <b>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b>  <b>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>  <b>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b>  <b>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b>  <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b>	<b>1. yes, it is important for the community related to agricultural issues and soil and nutrient improvements.</b>  <b>2. in agreement, no suggestion</b>  <b>3. In agreement.</b>  <b>4. The following table should be included in the document's sections, but in tables of results, the footnotes should be supplemented by integrating the abbreviations indicated.</b>  <b>5. is correct, but it is necessary to add a section on statistical analysis, since in the results and discussion it points out significances that are not clear in the results.</b>  <b>6. yes, they are sufficient and are used in text and discussion of results.</b>  Minor details in the presentation of the tables are corrected.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  <b>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	no comments.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

### **PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Maria Maldonado Vega</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Hospital Regional De Alta Especialidad Del Bajio, Mexico</b>