

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_102904
Title of the Manuscript:	Variation in soil chemical properties and yield of cowpea under graded doses of magnesium application in Ultisol of Kerala
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>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, this manuscript is very important for scientific community, because in current situation soil resource is affected by different limitation of essential nutrients and this lead to soil the soil infertile and unproductive</p> <p>2. The title of this article is suitable and clear for reader</p> <p>3. Yes it is. But it needs clarity in methodology part about the methods used</p> <p>4. The subsections are not clearly indicated in the manuscript and the structure of the manuscript is well stated.</p> <p>5. The manuscript is scientifically correct</p> <p>6. The reference is old and not sufficient (Soniya V.P,2021(Critical level of magnesium for cowpea [Vigna unguiculata (L.) Walp.] in ultisols of kerala), Muhammed Atif etal, 2023. Magnesium application improves the morphology, nutrients uptake, photosynthetic traits, and quality of tobacco (Nicotiana tabacum L.) under cold stress</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes, the language used in this article is suitable for scholarly communication</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Generally, the article is well prepared and the laboratory result is at acceptable range as different scholars stated in different articles.</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:	Derese Abi Mamo
Department, University & Country	Wollo University, Ethiopia