

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Plant &amp; Soil Science</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJPSS_104791</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Characterization of soil properties and their relationship with various sulphur fractions in Groundnut Farming Regions of Bikaner District</b>
Type of the 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> )

## 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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Sulphur contents in soils and its importance for plant nutrition are subjects not often approached by scientific research. So this paper comes with an important contribution to the field.</li> <li>2. Yes, the title is appropriate, it reflects the research content.</li> <li>3. Yes, the Abstract is comprehensible; it summarizes the methods, results, and findings of the research.</li> <li>4. Yes, the subsections and structure are correct; they make the manuscript clear and easy to read.</li> <li>5. Generally yes, the manuscript is correct; the circumstances and research methods are clearly presented, as are the data in tables, and the discussions are pertinent, clear, and well explanatory, well backed by literature, and consistent with the findings. I detailed a few exceptions below.</li> <li>6. The References show a thorough documentation which can also be noticed in the Discussions section. They cover a large time span, from older ones for analytical methods, for example, to quite recent research.</li> </ol> <p>I think it is important to specify the fertilization technologies applied in the four research location as they influence the contents and availability of nitrogen, phosphorus, and potassium, hence their relationship with sulphur contents. Specify the number of collected samples, total and by tehsil and the sampling depth. Align tables' number in the text: it seems that Table 2 is cited as table 1, Table 7 as Table 3... In the Results section, b., the measurement units for calcium carbonate are inconsistent. Specify the units of measurement in Table 6, maybe in tables 7-11 too. The sentences "the region falls under very high salinity" (c.) and "EC values show no constraint of salinity in sampling area" (d.) contradict each other. The viable explanation of high pH is that given in the Discussion section. Give references for classification of available nitrogen, phosphorus, and potassium by categories. The total sulphur and its different forms contents must be also presented and discussed.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></li> </ol>	<p>Language and English quality are fine, suitable for scientific papers. Minor typing corrections are needed.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>The Introduction is a very clear, well documented, and up to date presentation of the matter background and reasons for the research. Very clear and comprehensive presentation of experimental data.</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>	<u>No</u>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Mihaela Lungu</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>National Research and Development Institute for soil Science, Agrochemistry and Environment, Romania</b>