

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_102817
Title of the Manuscript:	UNCOVERING THE IMPACT OF EROSION CONSERVATION TECHIQUES ON SOIL ATTRIBUTES IN SHIVALIKS OF LOWER HIMALAYAS OF JAMMU
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> )

### 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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The question, the manuscript attempts to answer is of paramount importance to the scientific community.</li> <li>2. The title is suitable</li> <li>3. The abstract is not structured. It fails to adhere to the rules of a scientific article.</li> <li>4. The subsections are not appropriate as some subsections that were supposed to appear in the results and discussion section are instead present in the Material and methods section.</li> <li>5. The manuscript is scientific correct although lacks some scientific soundness at the level of the introduction. The author seems to be a non-native speaker of English language. This justifies the wrong use of some words in the manuscript. The author has to be consistent in using certain style of citation inside the manuscript.</li> <li>6. The reference section is sufficiently written. However, there are many old sources cited, some dating far back as 1934.</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>	<p>The manuscript has a lot of grammatical and syntax errors and use of wrong words. The author should thoroughly revise the manuscript and resubmit for further review.</p>	
<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)
<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:	<b>Efuetlancha Ernest Nkemele</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Dschang, Cameroon</b>