

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Journal of Plant &amp; Soil Science</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_128319
Title of the Manuscript:	Soil Physio-chemical Behaviour in Response to Phosphorus and PSB Application in Mustard Fields under Gmelina Agroforestry
Type of the Article	

#### **General guidelines for the Peer Review process:**

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

#### **Important Policies Regarding Peer Review**

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

### Review Form 3

#### PART 1: 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>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The study of soil physicochemical parameters during the application of phosphorus and phosphostabilising bacteria in mustard fields is key to improving soil fertility and quality. This allows us to optimise fertiliser use, increasing the efficiency of crop production and reducing the negative impact on the environment. Such research contributes to more sustainable agriculture by improving soil health and ensuring long-term field productivity. They also help to make informed decisions about agroforestry practices.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title of the article fully corresponds to its content.	
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.	The abstract corresponds to the content of the article.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The abstract of the article is comprehensive.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Most of the literature is up-to-date, but about 30% of the references are more outdated and should be replaced with modern ones if possible.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Minor revisions required related to English language and grammar.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Soil samples should have been taken from depths of 0-10, 10-20, 20-30, 30-40 and 40-50 cm.	

#### 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:	Yurii Dehtiarov
Department, University & Country	State Biotechnological University, Ukraine