

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Soil Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ASRJ_105494
Title of the Manuscript:	Quality of Tea Soil Induced by Cultivation Period
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.journalasrj.com/index.php/ASRJ/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment The paper has valuable info but needs to be improved the discussion	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. <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	The manuscript has important information Title is suitable Abstract is right Subsections and structure are correct The manuscript is correct References are enough	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Writing quality is good enough	
Optional/General comments	The manuscript is returned with some observations in red There are some observations: 1) Figure 3 y-axis legend is non-legible 2) Figure 3 shows available NPK, figure 4 shows total NPK I think it should be better to compare both data for the same time (10 years NPK available vs total) it can be through bars plot 3) Table 3 presents 2 data set a) and b) but it is not clear the purpose of the reported data 4) Also authors use nomenclature like CP, TP, SD, Sig, but they don't provide the meaning of each one Optional: considering the approach of surface response analysis instead the multivariate test	

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:	Maria Maura Margarita Teutli León
Department, University & Country	Benemérita Universidad Autónoma de Puebla, Mexico