

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Journal of Plant &amp; Soil Science</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_103720
Title of the Manuscript:	SOIL PHYSICO-CHEMICAL PROPERTIES IN DIFFERENT FORESTES OF TEHRI & PAURI-GARHWAL HIMALAYS, UTTARAKHAND, INDIA.
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><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 manuscript is important for scientific community, the aim of the present investigation being to analyse soil properties in different forest areas across different altitudes of Garhwal Himalayas i.e., <i>Quercus leucotrichophora</i> Forest (&gt;1900m), <i>Anogeissus latifolia</i> Forest (1300m), Mixed Forest (900m) and Shrub Dominated Forest (600m).</p> <p>2. Yes, the title of the abstract is suitable.</p> <p>3. The abstract of the article is comprehensive.</p> <p>4. The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate.</p> <p>5. Yes, the manuscript is scientifically correct. The text is clear and easy to read.</p> <p>6. The list of references could be improved because the subject is very discussed in the literature on the field.</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 English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>Attention at the reference list. Some names of species are not italic.</p> <p>Munesh Kumar*, Manish Kumar, S. S. Khan, M. Joshi, S. Kumar, J. A. Bhat (2012). Soil organic carbon stock potential of shrubs, occupying natural <i>Anogeissus latifolia</i> forest in sub-tropical belt of Garhwal Himalaya. Journal of Ecology and the Natural Environment. Vol. 4(8), pp. 219-222.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Dumitru Gabriela</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Alexandru Ioan Cuza University of Iasi, Romania</b>