

Journal Name:	Journal of Global Agriculture and Ecology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JOGAE_12560
Title of the Manuscript:	Nutrient Release Pattern and Soil Enzyme Activities of Calcareous Soil As Influenced by PROM
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

PART 1: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript is a welcome step in utilising PROM to enhance phosphorus availability and consequent crop uptake. This research offers a piece of baseline information towards improving the availability of phosphorus by enhancing soil enzyme activities that are responsible for the release of fixed phosphorus. It elucidates mechanisms through which phosphorus can be maintained through improved cycling in agroecosystems without using chemical fertilisers.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title of the manuscript is suitable. Nonetheless, the author should consider writing "PROM" in full. Again I want to understand why the reader left RDF and Soybean in the title. It makes much sense for them to make part of the title.	

<p>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.</p>	<p>The abstract is comprehensive. However, the authors should consider writing the meaning of the abbreviations as they first appear in the abstract. Some unknown abbreviations make it difficult for the reader to understand the message of the abstract. Remember that as much as the abstract is the summary of the whole work, it should be able to stand alone.</p> <p>The author needs to clarify these two lines:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To study the nutrient release pattern and soil enzyme activities of calcareous soil as influenced by various levels of phosphorus using organic and inorganic sources. 2. This research aimed to understand the performance of varying levels of P2O5 influencing nutrient cycling and soil properties in calcareous soils. <p>The authors should consider omitting one line from the above two in the abstract. It is becoming difficult to understand the goal of the study.</p>	
<p>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</p>	<p>The manuscript is scientifically correct. Though, I would want to see the knowledge gap that this work seeks to address. Where do we base this work in relation to previous done work on similar topic?</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>The references are sufficient but the manuscript could benefit from more recently published work especially in the introduction unless if there are none.</p>	
<p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The english quality of the manuscript is suitable for the scientific community.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>The materials and methods as it stands of this work is weak. There are no laboratory and statistical procedures for the analysed soil properties. No clear hypothesis or research question is included in the manuscript. I see a mention of correlation in the abstract but no method for that. How did they handle the replications. Statistical analysis should be included in the manuscript. I would suggest the authors to include pictures in their methodology to enhance the delivery of the message. Study area map is also missing. Help your readers to understand your laboratory and area in general.</p>	

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Seome Michael Swafo
Department, University & Country	University of Limpopo, South Africa