

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_127922
Title of the Manuscript:	Effects of artificial soil fertility gradient strategy on the soil fertility, nutrient uptake and growth attributes of Chakravarthi keerai (<i>Chenopodium album</i>)
Type of the Article	Original Research 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>

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.		
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
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.	No	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes	

Review Form 3

<p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Overall, the manuscript needs extensive language editing and formatting.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>Introduction *Hypothesis of the work is not well formulated in the 'Introduction' section. The authors did not present a justification for carrying out this study. What is the hypothesis of the present study? *It is insufficient and needs more improvement. *The work must be identified and stated more carefully. The authors have to try to explain why this paper is relevant to the wider readership. *Authors should show the limitations of previous papers.</p> <p>Results *Result should be written in concise way. *Some parameters must be represented in figures such as plant height, number of leaves plant-1 and number of primary branches plant-1. * Duncan's Multiple Range Test should be done to understand the statistical significance among the treatments for different parameters.</p> <p>Discussion *Need more improvement. It is too superficial and not a meaningful discussion. Author should try to strengthen the discussion part. *Put reason why this type of result is obtained.</p> <p>Conclusions *Authors need to rephrase the "Conclusions" section. *Add some limitations, underscore the scientific value added of your paper, and/or the applicability of your findings/results and future scope of study. *Overall, the manuscript needs extensive language editing and formatting. There are so many typography mistakes in the manuscript.</p>	

PART 2:

	<p><u>Reviewer's comment</u></p>	<p><u>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)</u></p>
<p><u>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</u></p>	<p><u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u></p>	

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Abhik Patra</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Dr. Rajendra Prasad Central Agricultural University, India</p>