

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_96670
Title of the Manuscript:	AMELIORATION OF SOIL ACIDITY WITH LIME FOR SUSTAINABLE SOYBEAN PRODUCTION ON FERRALITIC SOILS – A REVIEW
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)
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)	<p>It is a review paper, properly researched with as many as 85 references – pretty good.</p> <p>Title is Ok. I only added the phrase “of Uganda”.</p> <p>Yes. Fairly comprehensive.</p> <p>Yes, they will do for a review paper. Yes. I have suggested adding sections on overliming and complexities of LR determination.</p> <p>I think they are fine.</p> <p>There are areas where chemical equations would do better than words. Also, the author should consider the length of the paras – too long paras are scary.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Language quality is Ok in most cases. Where I had to make changes, I made them in red font.	
Optional/General comments	It is a good paper.	

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Godstevan Peter Maro
Department, University & Country	Tanzania Coffee Research Institute, Tanzania