

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Applied Life Sciences International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JALSI_128720
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of various levels, sources of Zn and Zn solubilizing bacteria on Zinc transformation in calcareous soil
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.	This manuscript highlights the importance of studying Zinc transformation in soils. This comes after noticing that most fertilisers applied are ineffective to remediate the deficiency of this element in soils. This study opens fresh eye to effectively managing fertilisers inputs in agricultural soils. With the kind of studies, we will effectively manage nutrients for crop uptake.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is suitable. However, the authors can improve it by marrying it with the results: What did they investigate and what did they find?	
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 is comprehensive; however, the authors must define most of the abbreviations. It makes it hard to follow the abstract with some of the undefined abbreviations like WS-Ex.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript is scientifically correct. Big advice, the authors should consider having figures (study area and results) in their manuscript. A combination of tables and figures will improve the readability of this work.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes, the references are sufficient and recent.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The English quality is suitable for scholarly communications.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

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:	Seome Michael Swafo
Department, University & Country	University of Limpopo, South Africa