



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>International Journal of Plant & Soil Science</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_24271
Title of the Manuscript:	The Effects of Organic Acid Application in Soil on Extractable P and Eggplant (<i>Solanum melongena</i>) Yield
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>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

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>Line 52: OA can be released..... Don't use abbreviation to start a sentence or paragraph.</p> <p>Line 83 -84: In order to test effects on yield eggplant was used as a signal crop and a fruit yield was measured to determine..... Rewrite this sentence like this: Eggplant was used as a model crop to test effects of OA applications compared to conventional fertilizer on eggplant yield.</p> <p>Line 100: Prior to treatment, soils were analyzed several parameters. Rewrite this sentence like this: Prior to treatment, soils were analyzed for several parameters</p> <p>Line 100 – 104: Supposed to be in Result and Discussion section not under materials and methods.</p> <p>Lots of mix-up in the materials and methods section. Rewrite this section, make it concise, coherence and understandable.</p>	<p>The sentence now reads Organic acids can be released by</p> <p>Now rewritten as suggested</p> <p>Now rewritten as suggested</p> <p>This has been moved to Results and Discussion</p> <p>Methods and Materials has been thoroughly reviewed by 3 colleagues and 3 independent reviewers, without comment. Without specific comments from this reviewer regarding exactly what needs changing we cannot make further changes and feel it is acceptable. Also, this is only reviewer of 5 that had any issue with the section.</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>In Results and Discussion section, authors did not support their findings with other related references from other researchers.</p> <p>This is not the way to write conclusion section. Conclusion is too lengthy. Make your conclusion concise and understandable.</p> <p>This manuscript needs thorough revision.</p>	<p>This was done in the conclusion section, we have moved much of this to the subheading: 3.2 Discussion and reduced the conclusion to a single paragraph.</p> <p>Within this there are numerous references discussing other findings in comparison.</p>
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		<p>We want to thank this reviewer for providing a thoughtful review.</p>