

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Journal of Plant &amp; Soil Science</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_125942
Title of the Manuscript:	Study of the dissolution of Tahoua natural phosphate by mineral acids : hydrochloric acid and sulfuric acid
Type of the Article	

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION 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. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The peer-reviewed article "Study of the dissolution of Tahoua natural phosphate by mineral acids: hydrochloric acid and sulfuric acid" is interesting and relevant. I have no problem reviewing this article because I believe the authors have done a sufficient literature search that has resulted in original research that is reliable enough to add to the existing knowledge on the subject. More importantly, it will undoubtedly direct further research in this field into the efficiency of phosphorus use - to make phosphorus from phosphorites more available to plants. dissolve Tahoua phosphate in hydrochloric acid and sulfuric acid solutions of various concentrations and exposure times.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title of the article is appropriate.	
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 exhaustive	I wanted to delete the beginning of the first sentence of the summary “for the purpose of research on”.
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The structure of the manuscript is appropriate and contains the necessary sections.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	<p>The authors of the article theoretically investigated the problem of dissolution of Tahoua natural phosphate with mineral acids. To study the effective transformation of natural phosphorus into nutrient phosphorus for plants, natural phosphates from Tahua were dissolved in mineral acids of different concentrations - hydrochloric and sulfuric. The study showed that the dissolution of Tahoua natural phosphate actually depends on the concentration of the prepared solutions and the dissolution time. The results of this study clearly show that the longer the attack time, the greater the dissolution.</p> <p>The research is ethical, scientifically correct and correct. The authors use modern, generally accepted scientific terminology. However, I recommend making some changes to the article before acceptance and publication.</p> <p>1. It is appropriate to indicate where the research was conducted (in which Institute, laboratory.).</p> <p>2. The article actually lacks the results of mathematical and statistical processing of the obtained data. It is necessary to list them, indicate which methods and programs were used in the calculation.</p>	<p>1 This research was carried out at the Abdou Moumouni University in Niamey (Niger), at the Materials, Water and Environment Laboratory, Chemistry Department, Faculty of Science and Technology.</p> <p>2. The results were processed and calculated using Excel software.</p>
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :	The list of used literary sources is sufficient, but contains few new references to the topic of research in the last 10 years.	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments  Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language of the article is suitable for scientific communication.	
Optional/General comments	In conclusion, I believe that the article deserves to be published after a little revision.	

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>	I agree with all the reviewer's comments. The reviewer's suggestions will be taken into account in the manuscript.