

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Soil Science and Plant Nutrition
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJSSPN_122130
Title of the Manuscript:	Influence of liming and phosphorus application on growth of Soybean in acidic soil of Chandauli.
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<p>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.</p>	<p>I have no doubt about the originality of the subject of the study. The loss of the soils we have today due to anthropogenic effects is increasing day by day, and the increasing human population limits nutrition. For all these reasons, the restoration of marginal lands to agriculture is significant.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>suitable</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The abstract is concise but could be more informative. It should include more specific details about the research methods used and the significance of the findings. The background and rationale for the research are not clearly articulated. This could help in understanding the importance of the study.</p> <p>Include the research problem, the methodology in brief (e.g., type of study, sample size), and the key results with a mention of the implications.</p> <p>Ensure that the abstract stands alone, giving the reader a clear understanding of what the study is about and why it matters.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The introduction provides context but could benefit from a more robust discussion of the literature that directly supports the research question. There is a lack of a clear thesis statement that guides the reader through the paper.</p> <p>The methodology section provides a basic overview of the research design but lacks sufficient detail. It is important to clearly describe each step of the research process, including how participants were selected, what instruments were used, and how data was analyzed. There is a need for a stronger justification of the chosen methods. Why were these particular methods selected? How do they suit the research questions or hypotheses? Ethical considerations are briefly mentioned but should be more thoroughly discussed. Explain how consent was obtained, how participant confidentiality was maintained, and how any potential risks were mitigated.</p> <p>The results are presented clearly, but the section could benefit from more interpretive commentary. The data is there, but it needs to be more explicitly connected to the research questions. While the text is clear, the use of tables and figures could be enhanced. More visuals could help in illustrating complex data points or trends.</p> <p>The discussion provides a good interpretation of the results but could go deeper in comparing these findings with existing literature. More attention should be given to how the findings corroborate or challenge previous studies. While some limitations are mentioned, the discussion could be more transparent about the study's limitations and how they might affect the findings. The section briefly mentions areas for future research, but this could be expanded. Suggesting specific avenues for future studies would strengthen this section.</p> <p>Enhance the literature review within the introduction to clearly establish the gap your research addresses. Add a clear thesis statement or research objective towards the end</p>	

Review Form 3

	<p>of the introduction.</p> <p>Provide more detailed descriptions of the research design, sampling methods, data collection instruments, and analytical techniques. This should include specific information like the number of participants, how they were recruited, and the type of data analysis software used. Explain why certain methods were chosen and how they align with the research objectives. Cite relevant methodological literature to support your choices. Offer a more detailed discussion of the ethical considerations involved in the study. This should include the process for obtaining informed consent, ensuring confidentiality, and addressing any ethical dilemmas that arose.</p> <p>As you present each result, explicitly link it back to the research question it addresses. This will help readers understand the significance of the findings. Include more tables, graphs, or charts to visually represent key findings. Ensure these visuals are well-labeled and referenced in the text.</p> <p>Provide a more detailed comparison of your findings with those from other studies. Discuss how your results confirm, contradict, or extend previous research. Be upfront about the limitations of your study. Explain how they might influence the results and what could be done in future research to address these limitations. Offer more detailed suggestions for future research. Identify specific questions that remain unanswered or new avenues that your findings open up.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The topic is good, the way it is handled is good, but there are deficiencies in the writing of the article. in the previous section I wrote in detail what needs to be done.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p> <p>:</p>	<p>References are absolutely insufficient.</p> <p>I want the author to review the two articles I wrote in the feedback section and edit the method section and I want these two articles to be cited.</p> <p>Zahraeni, N. A., & Uygur, V. (2024). Effect of Low Molecular Weight Organic Acids and Liming on Phosphorus Adsorption in Acidic Tea Soils in the Black Sea Region, Türkiye. Communications in Soil Science and Plant Analysis, 1-18.</p> <p>Gökmen, F., Sukuşu, E., Şimşek, U., & Uygur, V. The Role Of Liming In Copper Adsorption Of Acidic Soils. Carpathian Journal of Earth and Environmental Sciences February 2024, Vol. 19, No. 2, p. 313 – 320</p>	
<p><u>Minor REVISION</u> comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>suitable</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>The subject is good, but the presentation of the data and their interpretation is very weak and should be corrected.</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>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u></p>	

Review Form 3

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Fatih Gokmen
Department, University & Country	Igdir University, Turkiye