

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_104791
Title of the Manuscript:	Characterization of soil properties and their relationship with various sulphur fractions in Groundnut Farming Regions of Bikaner District
Type of the Article	Original Research Paper

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Yes, the manuscript is important for the scientific community but the study was almost 8 years old.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Should be rewritten.</p> <p>No</p> <p>Hope so.</p> <p>References are sufficient but more recent literature should be cited.</p> <p>No.1. Abstract should be rewritten. No.2. Introduction should be written properly No.3. Go through the Materials and Methods section and represent appropriately. No.4. Results and Discussion should be under one heading. No.5. No clarity in conclusion. Please rewrite it again. No.6. References should be written according to the journal pattern.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Can be improved more.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>It would have been better if the study would have 1-2 years old.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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> No	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Chadetric Rout
Department, University & Country	Maharishi Markandeshwar Deemed to be University, India