

**ReviewForm1.7**

JournalName:	<b>InternationalJournalofPlant&amp;SoilScience</b>
ManuscriptNumber:	<b>Ms_IJPSS_110733</b>
TitleoftheManuscript:	<b>Effectofsoilamendmentsandnutrientmanagementongrowthandgrowthattributesoftannia(Xanthomasagittifolium(L.) Schott)intheSouth-CentralLaterites (AEU 9) of Kerala, India</b>
TypeoftheArticle	<b>OriginalResearchArticle</b>

## ReviewForm1.7

### PART 1: ReviewComments

	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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. Yes, manuscript itself is important and specifically meets requirements of organic farming, because of Compost and on other hand of experiments with Phosphogypsum; with is a problem for the use of phosphogypsum as fertilizers, because they are considered industrial waste and ways of using them are being discovered.</p> <p>2. Yes, the title of the article suits with research and results.</p> <p>3. Yes</p> <p>4. Yes, experiment is clear and presentation of methodology part and results keeps structure, but schematical explanation of field experiment can be helpful.</p> <p>5. Yes</p> <p>6. Only 10 publications of 29 reviewed were published after year-2000., another 5 of the most recent ten are older than 10 years. The list of publications should be updated, this would significantly improve the quality of the work and would give a higher added value to future citations of the article and emphasis on the relevance of the research.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>1. I suggest you use English proofreading services</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>The purpose of the work is clear, but the tasks of the work are not clear, which would allow for accurate and consistent conclusion to be formed by substantiating them with observational data.</p> <p>I suggest that the authors significantly adjust the conclusions by supplementing them with statistical data and measurement results obtained during the experiment.</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>	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Vilda Grybauskiene
Department, University & Country	University of Applied Sciences, Lithuania