

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_127349
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of calcium sources and their mode of application on growth and plant nutrient uptake of two apple varieties grown under high density planting system
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

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)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Apples grown in Kashmir province are famous globally, but lack of post-harvest storage facilities deteriorate its quality and market acceptability. Calcium deficiency in acid soils deceives apple fruit quality.....published manuscript with minor correction published manuscript with minor correction	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	yes	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	yes	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	yes	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The established orchard had plant to plant spacing of 2.6 feet and line to line spacing of 10.4 feet. After demarcation, randomisation of treatment combinations was done using R- software. RBD with 3 factors i.e., varieties, different fertiliser sources having different modes of application and concentration of fertilisers with three replications. Needs spelling corrections	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes Needs correction in referencesmethods of writings	
Minor REVISION comments	article suitable for scholarly communications	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Minor corrects needs	
Optional/General comments	Published with minor correction	

Commented [DAY1]: Randomization

Commented [DAY2]: Fertilizer

Commented [DAY3]: Fertilizer

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:	Ashok Kumar
Department, University & Country	IIMT University, India