

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Plant &amp; Soil Science</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJPSS_107951</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Effect of Zinc Fertilization on Nodulation, Chlorophyll, Yield and Quality of Soybean Grown in a Vertisol of Central India</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>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)</b>
<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, but need improving language, interpreting the anova result correctly and rewriting</b></p> <p><b>No, it does not address the factors tested. "Effect of Zn application frequency and rate on nodulation, chlorophyll content and yield of soybean at..."</b></p> <p><b>No. It should be rewritten, it lacks all the contents the study addressing,</b></p> <p><b>Not well structured.</b></p> <p><b>Yes with big modification</b></p> <p><b>Yes</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>Title: the title and what discussed not similar, rewrite the title</p> <p>Introduction: Lack coherence, strong combination of statements, the literature section doe not worth the study, no objective stated</p> <p>Material and methods: the section contains only few variables to be measured. There are other variables not presented in material and methods section</p> <p>Result and discussion: The study consists two factors: Zn application frequency and Rate of Zn application. Besides the data also recorded at three stages of growth.</p> <p>But the result is not presented with what ANOVA said. The presentation and discussions of each factor effect at each time of data collection not well presented. The factor effects both frequency and rate not sequentially presented. The content lack scientific standard. There also language problem in order to discuss the result of each factors clearly.</p> <p>The presentation is not well structured and do not follow the scientific standard discussion of the result: For each variable the effect of each factor at each time of record, for example 30 DAS should first discussed before moving to the same factor effect to the other time of result</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>The manuscript need rewriting correcting the language of expression, improving the sequences of ideas,</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>Zenebe Mekonnen</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Arba Minch University, Ethiopia</b>