

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_104551
Title of the Manuscript:	Paper Mill Effluent is an Alternate for Irrigation and Nutrient Sources in Improving Soil Health and Agricultural Productivity
Type of the Article	Review 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><u>Compulsory</u> 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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>L = Line</p> <p>Abstract</p> <p>L17: "So we can..." -> Don't use "we", be impersonal.</p> <p>Introduction</p> <p>L27: "lakh" -> ???</p> <p>L33: "[1].The" -> space missing</p> <p>L33: give the meaning of the abbreviations BOD and COD</p> <p>L35: "higher[2]." -> another space missing. Check for missing spaces throughout the entire text.</p> <p>L39: "1.1 Pulp and paper industry history" -> Is this section part of the introduction or is it the Review itself? Do not subdivide the introduction into subsections.</p> <p>L72: "most polluting industries[6]." -> paragraph left L78:</p> <p>"manomeric" -> ??? monomeric?</p> <p>Table 1: "Tannins ,resin acids" -> check space left</p> <p>-> Table 1 was not referenced in the text.</p> <p>L91: "1.4 PAPER PRODUCTION PROCESS " -> this section should be before section 1.3</p>	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>-> Section numbering is not following a formatting pattern. Section 1.3 is in lowercase, section 1.4 is in uppercase. Check for proper formatting and numbering of sections.</p> <p>Figure 1: "Figure 1 was not explained. The process steps shown in the flowchart in Figure1 should be explained."</p> <p>L100: "Wastewater treatment methods" -> is this title a subsection of section 1.4? Confused. Verify proper numbering of all sections and subsections.</p> <p>L101-L109: References?</p> <p>L108: "waste water" -> wastewater?</p> <p>L109: "E (P) Act 1986 " -> what does it mean?</p> <p>L101-144 and L146-182: the text should be explanatory without the use of markers. L163:</p> <p>"forms ([13]." -> paragraph</p> <p>L166: "(Peng Wang et al. 2008)" -> The citation of references was in the form of numbers, why is this line author/year in parentheses?</p> <p>L190-201: missing references.</p> <p>L198-199: format chemical formulas</p> <p>Table 3 -> The formatting of the first line should be different from the others. Aren't chemical elements supposed to be in ionic form? The unit (ppm) should be specified on the first line and not in the footer.</p> <p>L207: "of the crop (Table 3)." -> Table 3 or Table 4?</p>	
--	--	--

Review Form 1.7

	<p>Table 6: Confused. What does "1. Total porosity [39]" mean?</p> <p>Symbols for chemical elements should be in the corresponding ionic forms. Table</p> <p>7: "kg ha⁻¹" -> Format.</p> <p>Figure 2: I see no need for a three-dimensional graph. The graph could be two-dimensional. The unit (%) is missing on the Y-axis.</p> <p>-> some general aspects of the text need to be improved: sequence and organization of sections, some explanations presented very succinctly in the form of tables making it difficult to understand.</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>L272: "Now a days" ->??? Nowadays?</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Minor correction is required.	
Optional/General comments	Must follow author's guideline.	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Thiago Simonato Mozer
Department, University & Country	Universidade Federal Fluminense, Brazil