

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_114299
Title of the Manuscript:	The Availability of Soil N, P, K, and Mustard Yield After the Application of Liquid Organic Fertilizer from Household Waste in Ultisols
Type of the Article	Original

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> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. The article is very important for the scientific community especially for those interested in field based experimentation. The research output is based on tangible scientific evidences that contribute to organic farming which is eco-friendly in nature. The manuscript can serve as important reference material for those scientists interested to do research on related issues.</p> <p>2. The title is very suitable and it reflects the content of the manuscript. So I strongly recommend keeping as it is. No modification is required at least in my opinion.</p> <p>3. The abstract is not only succinct but it also contains all the required contents. In the abstract the research problem is presented; the research objective is given; the methodologies are briefly explained; conclusion is given; the findings are corroborated with evidences from literature review; recommendation is forwarded and finally keywords are listed. Thus, the abstract is comprehensive.</p> <p>4. The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate both in terms of chronology and idea flow. The idea flow in the paper is so coherent that it can be easily understandable to a reader.</p> <p>5. The article is scientifically correct as it followed the required scientific procedures. The presence of trial experiments and the control, the pre-test and post test of soil properties, the use of inferential statistics and determination of significance levels, etc, imply that the research work is built on robust scientific ground.</p> <p>7. I think the references are quite sufficient and they are recent ones. So no need of reviewing other references</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language is nice. It is almost entirely free from spelling and grammatical errors. No jargons are found in the manuscript. It is written in simple but easily understandable and attractive manner.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

[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:	Dugassa Negash
Department, University & Country	Wallaga University, Ethiopia