

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_102179
Title of the Manuscript:	Response of organic manures and rice residues on physical soil health parameters
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>)

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 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. <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	1. The manuscript is important for scientific community, the present study including awareness about the role about importance of physical properties for maintaining soil health. The authors concluded that use of FYM, vermicompost had improved the physical health of soil which leads to overall better health of soil. 2. Yes, the title of the abstract is suitable. 3. The abstract of the article is comprehensive. 4. The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate. 5. Yes, the manuscript is scientifically correct. The text is clear and easy to read. 6. The list of references could be improved because the subject is very discussed in the literature on the field.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications.	
Optional/General comments		

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>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Dumitru Gabriela
Department, University & Country	Alexandru Ioan Cuza University of Iasi, Romania