

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Journal of Soil Science and Plant Nutrition</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJSSPN_120925</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Assessing the Suitability of Potential Nitrification Rate Determined by Shaken Slurry Method to Capture the Contingent Effect of Liming of Two Tropical Soils</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (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.	This manuscript is important for the scientific community as it provides novel insights into the short-term effects of liming on soil nitrification, a crucial process for nitrogen management in agriculture. I appreciate the manuscript's clear hypotheses, detailed methodology, and robust statistical analysis, which contribute to the reliability and relevance of the findings. The focus on practical implications for farming and the potential for broader application across different soil types and regions make this study particularly valuable.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes. The title is suitable for the study	
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.	Abstract is comprehensive and well written. But restrict the word count to 250.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes. It is appropriate	
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 manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound due to its comprehensive and detailed experimental design, which ensures reproducibility and accuracy. The use of both traditional and modified P-buffers provides a novel approach to evaluating the impact of liming on potential nitrification rates, addressing a gap in current research. The clear articulation of hypotheses and thorough discussion of results demonstrate a strong understanding of the subject matter, further reinforcing the manuscript's scientific rigor.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	Some of the referenced literature is outdated, and there is a need to include more recent studies to support the findings.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Several typographical and grammatical errors throughout the manuscript affect its readability.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

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

**Review Form 3**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Poornachandhra Chidamparam</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>CSIR-Central Leather Research Institute, India</b>