

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Plant &amp; Soil Science</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJPSS_95139</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Study of Sulphur Fractions in Calcareous Soil by using different Sulphur Sources and Grades of Sulphur</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

	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 REVISION</b> 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><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>1. This article is the result of research, quite important in the scientific community</p> <p>2. The title of the article is in accordance with the discussion</p> <p>3. Abstract and discussion comprehensive</p> <p>4. Each part of the text structure is quite appropriate, of the statement needs to be added a minimum of 2 references, provide literature of at least the last 10 years</p> <p>5. This manuscript is scientifically justifiable</p> <p>6. In the discussion it is necessary to provide an explanation regarding data analysis. It is better if the table is placed in the middle, so that the writer can explain the meaning of the data. The results of data analysis need to be discussed based on previous similar studies. Please provide literature of at least the last 10 years</p>	
<p><b>Minor REVISION</b> comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	Language communication can be explained scientifically	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

### 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>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Cicilia Novi Primiani</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>PGRI Madiun University, Indonesia</b>