

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_98132
Title of the Manuscript:	The Dynamics of Phosphorus Availability Due to Various Ameliorants in a New Rice Field of Barito Kuala Regency South Kalimantan
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)	This article is original, the information it analyzes is interesting, especially because of the importance of phosphates in agricultural production. The background is appropriate to the objective of the investigation. The methodology was adequate to support the results. The analysis based on regression curves are correct. The results should be explained based on a) the nature of the soil improvers and not only with the statistical analysis so that it is a scientific article that contributes. b) The bibliography must be updated since more than 50% is over 10 years old. For what I decide is that it be accepted after the two aspects a and b) indicated in the results have been improved. If the authors make these changes, the paper could be accepted.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Juan Manuel Sanchez Yanez
Department, University & Country	Instituto de Investigaciones Químico Biológicas, Mexico