

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_102959
Title of the Manuscript:	Vertical distribution of forms of sulphur in relation to physicochemical properties of lateritic soils of Eastern India
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)	Yes it has additional information about S forms in soil The title already reflects the content The abstract also describes the contents of the manuscript. Yes it is appropriate. In the introduction it was stated that the soil samples were taken from land planted with rice but there was no information whether the land was given S fertilizer by the farmers? or Sulfur only sourced from the indigenous soil? Yes, the number of references is sufficient and the majority of publications are from the last 10 years.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	English is quite systematic, and easy to understand	
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:	Eko Hanudin
Department, University & Country	Universitas Gadjah Mada, Indonesia