

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_120818
Title of the Manuscript:	Response of Wheat plant grown on Calcareous, Sandy, and Clay Soils to Farmyard manure and Spirulina extract application as sustainable agriculture
Type of the Article	

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>Please write few sentences regarding the importance this manuscript for scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>This manuscript is valuable for the scientific community as it explores sustainable agricultural practices that enhance soil properties and wheat productivity using organic farmyard manure and Spirulina platensis extract. The findings demonstrate significant improvements in soil hydro-physical properties and wheat yield, offering a viable alternative to chemical fertilizers. This research is particularly important in addressing soil degradation and chemical pollution, providing practical guidance for diverse agricultural settings. I appreciate its contribution to sustainable agriculture, though a deeper analysis of long-term effects and economic feasibility would have been beneficial.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title "Response of Wheat Plant Grown on Calcareous, Sandy, and Clay Soils to Farmyard Manure and Spirulina Extract Application as Sustainable Agriculture" is clear and informative.</p>	
<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>	<p>The abstract is comprehensive and covers the main points of the study, including the objective, methodology, results, and implications. However, it can be made more concise and clearer with a few revisions. Here are some suggestions: Clarify Objective: The main objective could be stated more succinctly. Results Presentation: Simplify the description of results for better readability. Methodology Briefing: Briefly mention the experimental setup without too much detail. Conclusion: Add a concluding sentence summarizing the broader implications.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Statistical Method Section requires further discussion. It will be good for the author to explicitly incorporate the proper section on methodology of the ANOVA and LSD tests as claimed by the author in section 2.8 of the manuscript.</p>	
<p>Please write few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>This manuscript appears scientifically robust and technically sound. The study's methodology is well-defined, involving controlled field experiments in two distinct locations, which strengthens the validity of the results. The application of farmyard manure and Spirulina platensis extract is systematically compared to conventional mineral fertilizers, providing a comprehensive evaluation of their effects on various soil types. The assessment of multiple soil properties, nutrient concentrations, and microbial counts indicates a thorough approach to measuring the impact of the treatments. Additionally, the significant improvements in soil health and wheat yield suggest that the proposed sustainable practices are effective. Overall, the manuscript's detailed and systematic approach ensures its scientific correctness and technical reliability.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. :</p>	<p>Overall the references are recent and significant but following points must be considered before the article is proceeded further.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There are numerous references which are missing in the reference section while these are in the main text of the article few example are written below: Geris and Elsadany, 2021, Seğmen and Özdamar-Ünlü, 2023, Gafsi et al., 2006, Gold 1999, Noufal et al., 2005. Rasha 2005. FAO, 2021. Etc..... 2. Similarly there are many references which are given in the reference section while these are not present or mentioned in the main text of the article. Few examples are listed below: Kumar 2018 is missing in the main text of the article. 	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	There are many grammatical and editorial mistakes in the main text. The author is advised to revise the manuscript using some suitable editor to fix the grammatical and editorial mistakes. Further the manuscript is formatted manually it is apprised that the automatic heading options may be applied for the level 1,2, 3 for the ease of readability.	
Optional/General comments	Editorial and grammatical mistakes are major comment on the article. Further, the points made in conjecture with the point 1-7 must be considered for revised version of the article.	

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:	Rizwan Ahmad
Department, University & Country	School of Economics, Institute of Development Economics, Pakistan