

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Soil Science and Plant Nutrition
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJSSPN_113676
Title of the Manuscript:	Effects of NPKS Granular and Briquette Fertilizers on Some Soil Chemical Properties and Yield of Maize (Zea mays L.)
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

### 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><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>1. The topic of the article is constantly solved because is very important for production practice also (has an impact on the economy and environment also). The manuscript meets the criteria for an Original Research Article.</p> <p>2. The title of the manuscript is generally suitable.</p> <p>3. Comprehensiveness of the abstract is at an acceptable level.</p> <p>4. I propose to revise (modify) the structure of the article. In the part the Discussion, authors should compare their results with the research results of other authors. This is absent. If possible, supplement the results of other relevant authors or joint parts Results and Discussion into one part.</p> <p>5. Yes. The manuscript is scientifically correct. I accept the research methods chosen by the authors. I recommend supplementing the manuscript or correcting shortcomings resp. missing information according to the reviewer's suggestions - see comments of the reviewer in the manuscript.</p> <p>6. The references are sufficient in point of view quantity mainly. It is appropriate to cite more recent sources (ideally from the last 5 years). Necessary is to check the References format (style) according to instructions for authors (look <a href="https://journalijpss.com/index.php/IJPSS/about/submissions#authorGuidelines">https://journalijpss.com/index.php/IJPSS/about/submissions#authorGuidelines</a> ). Some in the manuscript cited/mentioned sources are not listed in References and not all References (authors/sources) are mentioned in the manuscript respectively different years of publication are mentioned. This problem must be solved!</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>The language quality of the article is generally suitable for scholarly communications. (see comments or reviewer in manuscript).</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>If possible, I recommend using photo documentation from the experiment. I think that in the future it will be necessary to incorporate economic aspects into the articles (cost, expected profit). It is necessary to disseminate the results to the farmers - science must be in contact with practice!</p>	

### 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)
<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>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Eduard Pintér</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Institute of Horticulture, Slovak University of Agriculture, Slovakia</b>