

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_96493
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of phosphorus, sulphur and gibberellic acid on growth, root nodules and yield of soybean [Glycine max (L.) Merrill]
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>)

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) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 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)	1. The manuscript is important for the scientific community, but the presentation of the manuscript should be thoroughly revised to become more concise. 2. The title is suitable 3. The abstract should be revised to show a clear idea of purpose, research problem, methodology, result and conclusion. 4. Conclusion section is not available 5. Scientifically is fairly correct. 6. The reference should be revised into a style recommended by this journal. I would suggest the author minimise repetition which makes the manuscript very difficult to read.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Spelling and grammar checkers should be used to minimise the mistake	
Optional/General 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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	I Gede Ketut Adiputra
Department, University & Country	University of Hindu Indonesia, Indonesia