

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Journal of Soil Science and Plant Nutrition</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJSSPN_119324</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Mapping of Available Sulphur in Soils of Nagapattinam District (Tamil Nadu) – A GIS Approach</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.journalajssp.com/index.php/AJSSPN/editorial-policy> )

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>This section must be elaborated; some more recent works may be referred and add. The reviewer noticed that some references are not reflected in the text, and some are not seen in the reference section. It is strongly advised that the authors pay attention to all the sections and then only submit them to the journal properly.</p> <p>Describe in detail. This section need to be discuss and properly provide the methodology.</p> <p>Results and the discussion part need to be rewritten or rearranged. I did not find much discussion; all the sections are poorly written, and the grammar of the manuscript needs to be checked.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>Figures need to be revised. The provided figures are very poor, and figure 2 needs to be rechecked. The authors have given three classes in the legend, and they have shown only one class in the map. If there is no class between medium and low, then what is the significance of showing them in the legend?</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>The authors need to provide scientifically processed meaning to this data; otherwise, it will be considered a data report of very simple and low local significance.</p> <p>The paper needs major revision/Reject.</p>	

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Swarna Latha. P</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Acharya Nagarjuna University, India</b>