

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_95318
Title of the Manuscript:	An Appraisal of Fertility Status of Problem Soils of Tiruchirappalli district in Cauvery Delta Zone, Tamil Nadu
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, the manuscript is important for scientific community and has practical applications for agricultural farms in Tiruchirappalli district, referring to soil fertility problems in that area.</p> <p>2. Yes</p> <p>3. The abstract of the article is sufficiently comprehensive.</p> <p>4. The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate.</p> <p>5. Yes, I think the manuscript is scientifically correct, but I believe that the scientific article needs some minor/medium revisions before being published.</p> <p>6. The references are sufficient and relatively recent, but it required some changes.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>1. Yes, the language I think is suitable for scholarly communications.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>I would like to make some comments (listed below):</p> <p>In text we have Vijayakumar <i>et al.</i> (2013), and to references appear Vijaya Kumar et al. (no.39). What is the correct name?</p> <p>In text we have Rajeswar and Khan (2007), and to references appear Rajeshwar and Khan (no.23).</p> <p>Pay attention to the names of the author in the bibliographic references!</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:	Mihai- Iacob Bentea
Department, University & Country	University of Agricultural Sciences and Veterinary Medicine, Romania