

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_95562
Title of the Manuscript:	Incubation studies to find out the transformation of different fractions of Boron
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)
<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. moderately</p> <p>2. Boron solubility study for agricultural use</p> <p>3. Yes, but I suggest compacting the abstract (do not include background)</p> <p>4. Yes</p> <p>5. Yes</p> <p>6. In some cases must cite recently references (mark in yellow)</p> <p>Although it was mentioned in the methodology that statistical data management was carried out, this is not observed. Important to put error bars in the bars of the graphs and to make a statistical analysis to demonstrate differences between treatments. The same information is presented in the tables and graphs: choose one or the other.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The first time like this: Boron (B) When referring to the chemical element, always use Boron with a capital letter. Respect space after point (in yellow) Improve your writing (yellow): Count the times you use the word boro in your document and reduce them as much as possible. Capitalize words you shouldn't (yellow) The use of @ is not understood The conclusions are too extensive: specify to answer the objective.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</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>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Alfonso Benítez de la Torre
Department, University & Country	México