

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_101359
Title of the Manuscript:	ASSESSMENT OF PHYSICO-CHEMICAL PROPERTIES OF SOIL FROM DIFFERENT BLOCKS OF ADILABAD DISTRICT, TELANGANA
Type of the Article	A routine job report

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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This report is not research but a routine job report. 2. The title of the article suitable. 3. The abstract of the article comprehensive. 4. The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate, but the topic "Conclusion" should be changed to "Conclusion and Suggestion." 5. The report is scientifically correct. 6. In-text citation: (Muthuaval et al., 1992) & Reference: Muthuvel, P., Udayasoorian, C., Natesan, R. and Ramaswami, P.R. (1992). Reference: 1, 2, 5, 7, 8, 9, 12, 13, 14, 15, 17, 20; does not appear in-text citation. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>The quality of English articles is suitable for scholarly communication.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Introduction:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What is the significance of this study? What problems can be solved in research or this action? 2. There are no concepts, theories, or related research that support the research at all. 3. This study How will the results be used? Does it meet the research objectives? <p>MATERIALS AND METHODS:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Lack of details of processing time because the time or season may affect the soil condition, controlling the sampling site and collection. 2. What's new about sample analysis? <p>RESULTS AND DISCUSSION: Presents only results, but there was no discussion of the results.</p> <p>CONCLUSION: It should suggest details of more soil solutions and future education to extend the research results to be used in a wide range.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Titiya Netwong
Department, University & Country	Suan Dusit University, Thailand