



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_34255
Title of the Manuscript:	Distribution of Sulphur in some soils of Meghalaya
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	ABSTRACT. Sulphate S varied between 2.89 and 4.02%... It would not be 2.65 and 4.29% of Total-S? The abstract requires a general conclusion. INTRODUCTION is compact and concise. Not Objections. MATERIAL AND METHODS I believe that a map would be important to locate the distribution of the soil types and the points where the soil was sampled, including the localities. The description of the methodology for determining water soluble S is missing. In order to obtain the results of N, P, K and S in kg/ha, did the 0.15 m depth and relative soil density has to be taken into account? The relative density is missing. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION On line 85. Where can the reader see the relationship between CEC and MO? Explain how sulphate adsorbed (ADS -S) may be greater than total sulphate (SUL-S) in Table 2 the first 3 soils.	% wise distribution of different form of S has been included in table 2 and Sulphate S varied between 2.89 and 4.02 %. General conclusion has been included in the Abstract. A map with localities has been included in the manuscript. The determination procedure of water soluble S has been incorporated. We did not measure the bulk density of soil. We calculated the correlation between CEC and OM ($r = -0.495$) which was not significant at $P=0.01$ and $P=0.05$ level. Kour et al.[26] also found more adsorbed sulphur (ADS-S) than sulphate sulphur (SUL-S) in soils but for us the reason may be different as we did not investigate.



SDI Review Form 1.6

From line 110 to line 115 the available S is described, then change the subtitle 3.2.1 to water soluble sulphur and available sulphur. Why is not the Available S in the Table 2? Will it be possible to state that a particular form of S was smaller or larger in the different soil orders when no statistical analysis was performed? Line 100-102; 118; 171. Line 120-121; 136 and other lines. Where does per cent? It would be interesting to put in the table 2 in parenthesis the representation in % of the different forms of S in relation to the total S. Line 141-142. Explain why adsorbed S does not correlate with Available S. 153-155 Explain why there is correlation with some and not with others. The same in line 166-168. In general when talking about correlation is observed in the article that the RESULTS are presented but the DISCUSSION is missing. CONCLUSION In conclusion the authors begin to discuss some results justifying why there are high levels of S available. I should do it in results and discussion. About "but small amount of organic manure would help improving the microbial activity in soil in order to transform the native S to plant available form" The results do not allow the conclusion that it is necessary to apply manure to improve the availability of S by microbial action. This was not analysed in this study.	The name of the subtitle has been changed as per suggestion. Available sulphur content has been included in the table 2. No, because of smaller sample size. The specific lines have been omitted. % wise distribution of different form of S has been included in table 2 as per requirement. There was mistake on data entry. The problem is no longer exiting. Discussion on correlation- Done The conclusion section has been modified completely.
---	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

	The aim of the investigation was not answered “forms of S and their correlation with soil properties in different soil orders” REFERENCES Of the 39 literatures consulted, only 7 are from the last 10 years and 17 from the last 20 years.	
Minor REVISION comments	When submitting the article to the CopySpider program, the same showed that there is similarity greater than 3% with two works, warning about the risk of plagiarism. https://www.isslup.org/Volume_22_Number_1/Forms%20of%20sulphur%20and%20their%20relationship%20with%20soil%20properties.pdf https://www.researchgate.net/publication/267544400_FORMS_OF_SULPHUR_AND_THEIR_RELATIONSHIP_IN_FOUR_CONTRASTING_AGRO-CLIMATIC_ZONES_OF_WEST_BENGAL_INDIA	S fractionation studies in Meghalaya soils are very rare. Many of the references are ascribed to methodologies which are quite old. However the references in the discussion part are rather recent. Work was done in unexplored area but there might have some sort of similarities in the explanation. We do not accept comment on plagiarism.
Optional/General comments		