

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_103502
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of different farming systems on soil health and yield of arecanut and black pepper
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>)

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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Importance: They studied the impacts of different farming practices (Recommended package of practice; RPP, Organic farming, Natural farming, and Chemical farming) on rhizosphere microflora, soil nutrient status, and yield of areca-nut and black pepper in a two-year (2020 and 2021) experiment. 2. Title: Preferred to be modified into “Different Farming Systems Concerning soil health and Yield of Areca-nut and Black Pepper”. 3. Abstract: Provide an opening statement of one or two short sentences as a background on the problem should be presented. Add the P-value side by side to the significant results. Many modifications were suggested to enhance the readability and understanding of the text. 4. Structure of the manuscript: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Keywords: Properly displayed and clear. Avoid abbreviations unless necessary. b. Introduction: Imperfectly displayed as one large paragraph. The introduction has to be rearranged into three paragraphs only i.e. 1. Introduction 2. Significance of the study, and 3. Aim of the study. Many modifications were suggested to enhance the readability and understanding of the text. c. The aim: Clear to a certain extent. Some modifications were suggested to enhance the readability and understanding of the text. d. Materials and methods: Please notice the following: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide the institutional ethical approval for the study. 2. Provide the total number of samples collected. 3. Provide the model and manufacturer of the systronic digital pH meter and spectroscopy used in the study. 4. Provide the software, the statistical model, and a reference for the statistical analysis. 5. Some abbreviations were illustrated without full names on their first appearance (DTPA). 6. Many modifications were suggested to enhance the readability and understanding of the text. e. Results: Novel. Reduce the use of numerical values and numbers in the text and instead describe your results. Add the P-value to the significant results in the text. Many modifications were suggested to enhance the readability and understanding of the text. f. Discussion: Clear, informative, and contribute to knowledge with moderate comparison and speculation. Some modifications were suggested to enhance the readability and understanding of the text. g. Conclusion: Clear. Some modifications were suggested to enhance the readability and understanding of the text. h. Tables: Well-presented and organized. Some modifications were suggested. i. Figures: Well-presented and organized. Some modifications were suggested. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. Scientific Soundness: The manuscript declared a good comparison of the agricultural conditions of areca-nut and black pepper in India. 6. References: Sufficient as 35% (7 out of 20) of the listed references were published in the past five years. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>General view: The manuscript was expressed in moderate English and grammar. A certain degree of copyediting and proofreading and references update have to be carried out before resubmission to achieve publishing value.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</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:	Essam Samir Soliman
Department, University & Country	Suez Canal University, Egypt