

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_104226
Title of the Manuscript:	Post Peat Fire Soil Natural Recovery Based on Physical Properties in South Kalimantan, Indonesia
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:

(<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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1.- Yes.</p> <p>2.- Yes.</p> <p>3.- Yes.</p> <p>4.- The structure is not correct. The titles are correct. Introduction, materials and methods, results, and conclusions. Abbreviations should be explained or placed on a table.</p> <p>5.- It is recommended to Reposition the tables, to suppress white spaces and excessive separations. The formulas are copied from another text as an image, losing quality, they must be written directly in the article.</p> <p>6.- Some more reference could be advised. Some more reference could be added, up to 40.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	-Yes	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>- Typographical errors to be corrected. Spaces after periods, hyphens, separations...</p> <p>- It would be interesting to give some more data in the conclusion, more information about the result obtained. Explain a little more the good results obtained.</p> <p>- As a tip, you can add a section, Analysis of the limitations of the study.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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:	Noé Anes García
Department, University & Country	University Oviedo, Spain