

ReviewForm3

JournalName:	InternationalJournalofPlant&SoilScience
ManuscriptNumber:	Ms_IJPSS_122598
TitleoftheManuscript:	Compostingcowdung enrichedwithvivianite(phosphocompost)foragriculturaluseintheBalazaLawanelocality(FarNorth,Cameroon).
TypeoftheArticle	

ReviewForm3

PART1: ReviewComments

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)
<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>The scientific methods that have been employed during the research are not a new thing globally, but considering the conditions and nature of importance particularly for the locality/region where research has been conducted. Definitely, the research work has scope for ensuring agricultural production in the region/country. The manuscript is scientific and technically sound.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Impact/Influence of cow dung composted with vivianite (Phosphocompost) in enriching/ameliorating the soil properties and nutrient availability in Balaza Lawane Locality (Far North), Cameroon</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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Paraphrase the aim in the abstract with a scientific explanation like to improve or enhance something (The content in the aim seems incomplete) • In case of the keywords focus more on the technical terms than the locality 	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The structure of the manuscript submitted is good.</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 scientific procedures employed in the research work were found to be good in terms of technical aspects. The procedures used were clearly described with supporting scientific explanations but the data seems a bit old as the research work was carried out in 2021 because, in the scientific community, there will be rapid changes within a few months/years (Need a formal explanation from the author). The manuscript is well-explanatory, understandable and helps future interested researchers to replicate the experiment.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>References included in the manuscript are sufficient. Except for some references, the majority were published in the past 10 years, but try to include the references that are published in the past 5 years in case of results and discussion as they are scientifically apt for a research paper.</p>	

ReviewForm3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Isthe language/English quality of the articles suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes, the language used in the manuscript is good but needs some minor corrections like paraphrasing and grammar.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduction: How increase in the rural population decreases soil fertility? (need explanation) • Improve the hypothesis part at the end of the introduction. • Material and methods: Need more explanation about rock phosphate and vivianite related to agriculture will improve the quality of the paper. • In detailed description of composting is required. • Mention which method is used for phytotoxicity name along with reference. • Which seed is placed in the Petri dish mention the crop name that will help the reader as it is not mentioned before. • Needs some paraphrasing in the monitoring changes. • Results and discussion: Temperature (why do temperatures suddenly peak on the 28th day need some detailed additional information?) • Why not much difference between control of compost and 10% when compared to the 20%? • Values of mg seem to vary a lot from control, 20% and 10% why? • In germination % (3rd line) and index (2nd line) you have used 25% seems confusing please rectify. • Ideal pH for soybean germination is 6.5-7 may vary till 7.5, but in research, it is 7.66 how it did not show any impact on germination please explain. 	

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><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Chakravarthy Thejesh</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Lovely Professional University, India</p>