

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Plant &amp; Soil Science</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJPSS_102904</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Variation in soil chemical properties and yield of cowpea under graded doses of magnesium application in Ultisol of Kerala</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> )

## 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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION 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. <b>Importance:</b> They conducted a pot culture study to determine the influence of varying magnesium levels on soil chemical properties and yield of cowpea in Ultisols of Kerala. They conducted the study in January-April 2019 using magnesium carbonate at levels 5 to 80 mg.kg<sup>-1</sup> was provided along with recommended doses of fertilizers for cowpea maintained in pots.</p> <p>2. <b>Title:</b> Non attractive and preferred to be modified into <b>"Magnesium Supplementation Concerning Soil Chemical Properties and Cowpea Yield in Ultisol of Kerala"</b>.</p> <p>3. <b>Abstract:</b> An opening statement of one or two short sentences as a background on the problem should be presented. Avoid the structured abstract and make it one unit. Many modifications were suggested to enhance the readability and understanding of the text.</p> <p>4. <b>Structure of the manuscript:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Keywords:</b> Re-arrange in alphabetical order as suggested.</li> <li><b>Introduction:</b> Improperly arranged into one large paragraph. The introduction has to be rearranged into three paragraphs only i.e. 1. Introduction 2. Significance of the study, and 3. Aim of the study. Some modifications were suggested to enhance the readability and understanding of the text.</li> <li><b>The aim:</b> Clear to a certain extent. Some modifications were suggested to enhance the readability and understanding of the text.</li> <li><b>Materials and methods:</b> Please notice the following: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provide the institutional ethical approval for the study.</li> <li>The soil analysis should be transferred to the results section.</li> <li>Provide the total number of samples collected.</li> <li>No statistical analysis section was provided, the software, the statistical model, and a reference.</li> <li>Some paragraphs have to be transferred from methodology to results (soil analysis) and vice versa (elemental determination).</li> <li>Many modifications were suggested to enhance the readability and understanding of the text.</li> </ol> </li> <li><b>Results:</b> Novel. Reduce the numerical value in the text and instead describe your results. Add the P-value to the significant results in the text. Some modifications were suggested to enhance the readability and understanding of the text.</li> <li><b>Discussion:</b> Clear to a certain extent with moderate comparison and speculation. Some modifications were suggested to enhance the readability and understanding of the text.</li> <li><b>Conclusion:</b> Clear. Some modifications were suggested to enhance the readability and understanding of the text.</li> <li><b>Tables:</b> Well-presented and organized. Some modifications were suggested.</li> </ol> <p>5. <b>Scientific Soundness:</b> The manuscript highlighted a novel and a good hypothesis.</p> <p>6. <b>References:</b> MUST BE UPDATED as 8.7% (2 out of 23) of the listed references were published in the past five years. The percentage has to increase to at least 30-40%. The lack of updated references indicated a study of lower interest.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p><b>General view:</b> The manuscript was expressed in moderate English and grammar. A certain degree of copyediting and proofreading and references update have to be carried out before resubmission to achieve publishing value.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> 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><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Essam Samir Soliman</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Suez Canal University, Egypt</b>