

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Soil Science and Plant Nutrition
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJSSPN_122561
Title of the Manuscript:	Micronutrient Formulations on the DTPA extractable micronutrient status in soil
Type of the Article	

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.	The manuscript is of no doubt important in increasing knowledge on soil science and micronutrient management.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is not comprehensive. It needs to show in which system and of which plantations and where	
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.	Not to my satisfaction. It does not fully summarize the paper. It should have significant and major results presented, tests for statistical analysis and the major inferences from the research.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	No. In as much as all sections seem okay, discussion has not been sighted despite being merged with results. The section is results and discussion. You have basically presented the results and you have not at all explained nor interpreted them. There is no discussion. How were the results different and why? Which other authors found similar results and which ones found contradicting ones? What was their conclusion and explanation and how does that relate to your work? Why were the results different in the different locations and why? Is this supported?	
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 technical part of the manuscript is okay. However the results are presented without explanations and interpretations. There is so much of inferences made which are not supported by other peoples works. This is not right.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	NO. You cannot have a paper with such meagre references. This work is not well read and therefore not well researched. Read more articles to support your work	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes but use scientific language. You cannot say for instance that results are harmless.	
Optional/General comments	N/A	

Review Form 3

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:	Vincent Rabach
Department, University & Country	Kenyatta University, Kenya