

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Soil Science and Plant Nutrition
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJSSPN_99918
Title of the Manuscript:	SOIL FERTILITY RECLAMATION OF ABANDONED MINED-LANDS THROUGH ORGANIC INTERVENTION
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.journalajsspn.com/index.php/AJSSPN/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>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>	<p>Yes</p> <p>Yes, though maybe 'abandoned mining sites' would be a better word?</p> <p>Yes, though what exactly farmer A did to improve the soil is lacking</p> <p>No, it is not according to the journal's guidelines</p> <p>Yes, but I still think the different amendments of the farmers should have been included</p> <p>Yes, but the format is wrong and the references in the text is not always correct</p> <p>Please refer to my suggestions in track changes in the attached document. I think this research can add value to the information for farmers, but it lacks the actual amendments that the different farmers used. It is easy to say A was better than B and C, but anyone reading the report, would want to know WHAT farmer A did. And the farmers themselves will need this information for practical reasons.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>Yes, except for the wrong way of referring to published articles as well as the use of unofficial abbreviations. These should be explained the first time they are used and used unchanged throughout the manuscript.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Please add the different organic interventions. You mention it in your title and then you never explain it.</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>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Anelia Marais
Department, University & Country	South Africa