

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Plant &amp; Soil Science</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJPSS_104226</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Post Peat Fire Soil Natural Recovery Based on Physical Properties in South Kalimantan, Indonesia</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### 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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>1. The peer-reviewed article "Post Peat Fire Soil Natural Recovery Based on Physical Properties in South Kalimantan, Indonesia" is interesting and relevant. I have no problem with reviewing this article because I think the authors have done a good literature search that has resulted in an excellent study that is powerful enough to add to the existing knowledge on the subject. More importantly, it will undoubtedly guide further research in this area on the effectiveness of peatland utilization and post-fire peatland restoration.</p> <p>2. The title of the article is appropriate.</p> <p>3. The abstract of the article is comprehensive.</p> <p>4. The structure of the manuscript is appropriate and contains the necessary sections.</p> <p>5. The manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>6. The list of used literary sources is sufficient and contains new references.</p> <p>7. The article does not contain the results of mathematical and statistical processing of the obtained data. It is necessary to add them and specify which methods and programs were used.</p> <p>8. In the methodological part, it is necessary to show the climatic conditions for conducting research.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>The language of the article is suitable for scientific communications.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>In my opinion, the article deserves to be published after a little revision.</p>	

### 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)
<p><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Olifir Yurii</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Institute of Agriculture of Carpathian Region, National Academy of Agrarian Sciences, Ukraine</b>