



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_50473
Title of the Manuscript:	Water Availabilities Associated with Natural Phosphate and Triple Superphosphate in Radish Cultivation
Type of the Article	Original Research 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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

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	<p>The novelty of the article is general, the manuscript was not well written, especially the introduction and result and discussion section, this paper needs careful and through revision. I suggest the author omit lots of paragraphs from the manuscript so that it looks integrated and structured.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The introduction was not well written. It was full of much improper sentences and words. Like –“which is why phosphate”, “to the need to” etc. The introduction section must be rewritten. 2. The result and discussion section was poorly written and was not clear enough; more specific interpretation must be given. 3. Sub-heading should be given in material method section which will increase the efficiency of the section 4. Re-write the conclusion without using paragraph. The first sentence of conclusion is baseless “which type of influence you are talking about”. <p>The English needs a lot of improvement. The manuscript is generally understandable, but the English is not standard in many places. Let the work be checked by native English speaker as there are several language errors in the manuscript.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The author should always italicized the P according to authors guideline ($P = .05$) 2. Use “parameters” instead of “variables”. 3. Table. 5 “%” sign is missing under field capacity heading. 	
Optional/General comments		



[SDI 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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sayma Samreen
Department, University & Country	Aligarh Muslim University, India