

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_127816
Title of the Manuscript:	Status and Distribution of Micronutrient in Litchi (Litchi Chinensis Sonn.) Orchards Under Subtropical Conditions of Himachal Pradesh
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 status and distribution of micronutrients in Litchi (<i>Litchi chinensis</i> Sonn.) orchards under subtropical conditions were studied. Soil analysis revealed high levels of all micronutrients except zinc, which was found to be medium. A significant positive correlation was observed between leaf iron, copper, manganese, and zinc concentrations and their respective soil availabilities. Their broader impact on the scientific community may be limited due to the study's regional focus and the relatively small scope of the analysis.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is good	
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 of the article is comprehensive. I don't suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript lacks scientific rigor due to its questionable interpretation of results. The use of tables is suboptimal, and the references cited are inadequate. There are other more reliable methods for interpreting soil analysis results, such as the restitution method.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are all prior to the year 2000, except for two, implying that they are not recent and are also insufficient. The authors failed to provide a more comprehensive and relevant discussion of the few results they found.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language had good quality	
Optional/General comments	The manuscript presents a narrow focus on soil and leaf analysis, failing to provide a comprehensive understanding of the broader ecological implications. The methodologies employed are outdated and insufficiently rigorous to support the conclusions drawn. Given these limitations, I do not recommend publishing this manuscript in its current form.	

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:	Gustavo Almaguer Vargas
Department, University & Country	Universidad Autónoma Chapingo, México