

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_119005
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of nutrient management on physico-chemical properties of soil of Indian mustard
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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Study is not sufficient and not sufficiently discussed to contribute significantly scientific community.</p> <p>The title of the article is suitable considering the study.</p> <p>Abstract needs addressing the significance of problem in one line at least. The abstract of the article is comprehensive taking the range of study, but the study itself in not comprehensive.</p> <p>The manuscript is scientifically okay.</p> <p>No, the references are neither sufficient nor recent.</p> <p>The detailed comments after reviewing the MS are given.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>The language of the MS is sufficient to address the problem and deliver the outcome of the study.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The biannual study 'Effect of nutrient management on physico-chemical properties of soil of Indian mustard' is insufficient in many terms to be published. Some of the key points this study lacks are appended here.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Citation of references are almost absent from Introduction part. Even the discussion part is not thoroughly discussed regarding the non-significant outcome of the study. Why the treatment 100% RNPKS and 2.5 kg Zn + 0.5 kg B + 500 kg has higher values for the selected treatments. 2. Studying the of effect of nutrient management on selected physico-chemical properties of soil of Indian mustard without the consideration of soil microbiota or fauna seems incomplete study to project the cause of given (though non-significant) changes of soil properties of mustard crop. Since the study mere analyzes the effects of nutrient managements on soil and not the effects on mustard plant growth and yield etc, the effects of mustard root exudates on soil properties needs to be studied? 3. In material and methods section neither the preparation of bacterial culture and cfu count of preparation has not been addressed nor the formulation and species composition of vermicompost. From where these species have been procured and identified is also not stated. Statistics of the experiment is not described in detail. 4. A graphical abstract of the experimental plots and treatment will better help in understanding of the experiment. Study seems partial compilation of study of selected works (from reference list) and lacks innovation and sufficient study. 5. List of the reference is very short and no up to dated. 	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mohd. Irfan
Department, University & Country	Institute of Information Management & Technology, Aligarh, India