

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_102599
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of different arsenic and biochar levels on soil microbial population and enzymatic activity
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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. In my opinion, the manuscript is important for the scientific community. It deals with a very intriguing subject as soil contamination may influence soil's microbial communities and therefore plant cultivation.</p> <p>2. The title of the article is suitable.</p> <p>3. The abstract is concise highlighting the most important points of the study.</p> <p>4. The manuscript is well-structured with the appropriate subsections.</p> <p>5. In my view, the manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>6. I recommend including more recent references (if it's possible) complementary to the already existing ones.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The study is well-written using the English language properly. I suggest revising the article and correcting a few grammatical and syntax errors.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>A very good point of your article is that you included detailed diagrams which help the readers to have a deep understanding of the results.</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:	Anthoula Gleridou
Department, University & Country	Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Greece