

## 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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</li> <li>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</li> <li>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</li> <li>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</li> </ol> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The manuscript is important for scientific community, knowing that the financial benefits of tin mining were short-lived and cannot be quantified with the consequences of its devastation, which is till negatively impacting on the environment. The present experimental study was conducted to unveil soil fertility variation across three adjoining smallholder farms due to varied organic intervention and advice accordingly for higher crop productivity.</li> <li>2. Yes, the title of the abstract is suitable.</li> <li>3. The abstract of the article is comprehensive.</li> <li>4. The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate.</li> <li>5. Yes, the manuscript is scientifically correct. The text is clear and easy to read.</li> <li>6. The list of references is large and relatively recently.</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</li> </ol>	The English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications.	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> 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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

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