

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_98970
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of nano-DAP on quality and soil characteristics of cabbage
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)	Yes it is Yes, but it should read Effect of nano-DAP of soil characteristics and quality of cabbage Yes, but to accommodate the changes proposed. Yes Yes They are sufficient but old ones should be updated Discussion should be beefed up, and a back up of at least two references. Authors should avoid use of & and also starting sentences with numbers or symbols. Number of replicate analysis should be given, followed by mean and SD or SE. Error bars should be inserted.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Okay	
Optional/General comments	Given above	

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ruth Wanjau
Department, University & Country	Kenyatta University, Kenya