

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_101318
Title of the Manuscript:	Inference of Rock Phosphate, Phosphorus Solubilizing Bacteria and Lime on phosphorus content and Economic yield of green gram
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> <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>	<p>The objective of this study is to evaluate the effects of of Rock Phosphate, Phosphorus Solubilizing Bacteria and Lime on phosphorus content and Economic yield of green gram.</p> <p>The title is clear and concise and highlights the content of the study.</p> <p>The abstract contains specific data; the most significant results are presented.</p> <p>The different sections of the article are clearly identified, and their content is consistent with the title of the section.</p> <p>The number of references is reasonable. The content of the article clearly shows that the cited references have been read and understood by the author, but most of them are old, the most recent dates from 2017.</p> <p>However, some remarks are made and to be taken into consideration in the final version of manuscript:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The objective of the study is not cited in the introduction. • the authors cited some abbreviations in the introduction without explaining them such as ATP, ADP, PSB..... Each abbreviation should be spelled out and introduced in parentheses the first time it is used in the text • the authors are invited to clarify the method used to separate the phosphorus fractions bound to calcium, Iron, Alimunium • 	
<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 style is clear and easy to read, there are no spelling mistakes.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The authors present here interesting results that we can recommend this article for publication with minor corrections.</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:	Taoufik Mohamed
Department, University & Country	Regional Center for Education and Training, Morocco