

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Journal of Plant &amp; Soil Science</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_85484
Title of the Manuscript:	Phosphorus fractions in soil: A review
Type of the Article	Review Article

### General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalijpss.com/index.php/IJPSS/editorial-policy> )

### **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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>The topic should have been <b>phosphorus fractions in soils of India</b>, because the author's discuss is more of Indian soil. Again, one cannot write an overview of global phosphorus in soil because it very dynamic. Therefore, it will be more informative if the writer streamlines the review in Indian soils only.</li><li>Although, the work is a review, the introduction should have an objective and specific objective.</li></ul>	Agreed. Title has to be changed as per suggested
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p><b>Abstract</b> – the first sentence has grammatical error and incomplete.</p> <p><b>Keywords</b> - ought to be up to five.</p> <p><b>Introduction</b> – the first sentence is incomplete.</p> <p>Grammatical presentation of sentence in third paragraph of introduction (line 17) is wrong.</p> <p>The sentence in Line 47 has no meaning.</p> <p>The table and figure suppose to be at the body of the write-up where they are mentioned not as appendix.</p> <p>Under the heading "status of phosphorus in soils", the author wrote 'The 0.28 % of phosphorus was reported in lithosphere (Clarke, 1920), which is comparatively higher than the soils of India'. I wonder if the author was comparing phosphorus in global lithosphere to Indian soil, or does he/she not know what a lithosphere is? Many more meaningless sentences like that are filled in this write up.</p>	<p><b>Abstract</b> : Agreed and corrected.</p> <p><b>Keywords</b>: Agreed and added</p> <p>Introduction: Agreed and needful done as per suggested.</p> <p>Yes, in comparison to (global) lithosphere, Indian soil have less Phosphorus.</p>
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The author should amend the grammatical errors in the text and have it make more meaning to the reader.	

Review Form 1.6

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>	