

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Plant &amp; Soil Science</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJPSS_97338</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Study of Physico-chemical and Nutrient Status of the Soil in Chiraigaon Block, Varanasi District, Uttar Pradesh</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### **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><b>Yes</b></p> <p><b>Yes</b></p> <p><b>Yes, but not in the correct format. Please consult the guidelines for authors of this journal</b></p> <p><b>The format is wrong. Please consult the guidelines for authors of this journal</b></p> <p><b>See the track changes with comments in this regard</b></p> <p><b>Some crucial information is lacking. Please refer to the track changes with comments in this regard</b></p> <p><b>Wrong reference style. Please consult the guidelines for authors of this journal. Whether the author feels the need to explain each protocol (I don't find it necessary, since they are all old established methods, like the Walkley-Black for organic carbon) or just refer to the method by name, all should be referenced accordingly.</b></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>No. The author jumps between American and English and should stick to one language. I have made some suggestions for correcting obvious language mistakes, but it should be proof-read by someone with a better grasp of English (or American?) than I have. The author repeats him/herself a lot of times. I have tried to change the sentences so that it reads more easily.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>I think this study has merit in that the results could help the local farmers. I would be careful of talking about soil quality, since it is widely understood that that also includes biological activity which was sadly not measured at all. Stick to physico-chemical nutrient status. I find a lack of background information, such as season, type of crop (or lack of?), agricultural management practices, fertiliser application (or lack of) just before sampling etc. The results of the soil samples mean nothing if some of the plots were fertilised just before sampling. It would only mean anything if ALL the plots (and surely it has to be plots and not villages that were sampled??) were managed in the same way. Is it irrigated or not? Is crop rotation practiced? What kind of fertiliser (if any and how much and when) are used? No till, deep tilling or minimum tillage? If any of these practices differ amongst the sites, it will have an influence on the results. The recommendation in the conclusion of using pig manure is all well and fine, but why pig manure? The author states that pig manure is high in K, but gives no reference. And K is but one of the many aspects measured in this study. What about recommendations (with appropriate references) for all the measured aspects? If I were a farmer, that is what I would like to know.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Anelia Marais</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>South Africa</b>