

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_111114
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessing the nutrient status and soil fertility by nutrient index for farmer’s fields soil samples in Chikkaballapura District, Karnataka
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	 1. Yes it is important for a scientific community but it needs to be reviewed to meet up scientific standards. 2. The title needs little adjustment suggested as "Assessment of the nutrient status and soil fertility using nutrient indexed of farmers' fields in Chikballapua district, Karnataka." 3. The abstract needs additional information such as method of soil sample collection, no of samples collected and analyses per taluk and per year, survey technique used and summary results of the nutrient status of the soils putting units of measurement before giving us the percentage low, medium or high. 4. Yes the subsections and structures are appropriate but needs additional information. Location map of Karnataka should be added highlighting Chikballapua district. In Figure 3, key should be added to differentiate the square from the diamond. In table 3 which nutrient/s has/have those ratings? PH, EC and OC are not part of soil nutrients. Soil nutrients are elements in the soil like Ca, K, Mg, Al etc. In the figures, state clearly which figure is a, b, c, d, e or f. 5. It did not meet scientific standards. I will give my suggestion below in the general comments section. 6. The references are sufficient and contains a combination of recent and old references. The references are not well written and they are not arranged alphabetically.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The English quality is good but there are some grammatical errors.	
Optional/General comments	To meet up with scientific standards, I suggest that the number of samples used for this research work should be uniform. He might have analysed more samples but he can use a total of 1,000 soil samples per year making it a total of 10,000 soil samples used for the study. The soil samples can be chosen randomly. The depth of collection should be stated clearly and it should be uniform because sampling at different depths can be a source of variation. Furthermore, CV is also needed. Annual variation and variation in the soils of the different taluks can be studied. Recommendations should be made taluk by taluk based on observations made from the study.	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Michael Akaninyene Okon
Department, University & Country	Federal University of Technology, Nigeria