

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_104107
Title of the Manuscript:	MORPHOLOGICAL CHARACTERISTICS OF FRUIT ORCHARDS AND THEIR INFLUENCE ON SOIL PHYSICO-CHEMICAL PROPERTIES
Type of the 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>)

Review Form 1.7

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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. The manuscript is important for scientific community but it is not strong. It should be strong. Its abstract, introduction and discussion should be strong.</p> <p>2. Title is not smart. The title should be rearranged: - EFFECT OF THE Morphology OF FRUIT ORCHARDS ON SOIL PHYSICO-CHEMICAL PROPERTIES in ----place.</p> <p>3. The abstract of the article is not comprehensive. Example, No clear purpose and method in the abstract part. Make strong</p> <p>4. Subsections and structure of the manuscript are shallowly appropriate. Vert week discussion, it should be strong.</p> <p>5. Yes</p> <p>6. References are too old. Please see, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2023.e16142 and https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2022.e10261</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Some corrections for examples:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Punctuation problem,. (Allen et al., 2004). ➤ Page 4, paragraph3, line 6, Spacing problem: solution.The ➤ Page 3, line 12, pHand EC was Replaced by pH and EC were 	
<p>Optional/General comments</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>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Tadele Buraka
Department, University & Country	Addis Ababa University, Ethiopia