

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Plant &amp; Soil Science</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJPSS_103064</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Physical and Chemical Properties of Hidimundige (Crown Choking) Affected and Healthy Arecanut Gardens of Chitradurga District, Karnataka</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### **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>)

## Review Form 1.7

### 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> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<p>1. Yes, but it should explain the relationship the chemical differences observed in the soil of contaminated and health plants should be explored, considering what happens to the contaminated plant that can cause these modifications in adjacent soil</p> <p>2. The title is suitable.</p> <p>3. The abstract is comprehensive; the idea is clearly and objectively exposed.</p> <p>4. The general structure of the manuscript is correct but, there are big problems in subsections:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Introduction:</b> there is only one refence! This section must show a recent review of the article's subject. If the references are not pointed is not possible to considerate that what is written is this review.</li> <li>• <b>Material and methods:</b> it is useful to say more detailed information of the spectrometers and used such as the model and mark. It should be given the specific information about the hollow cathode lamps that was used in this experiment.</li> <li>• <b>Results:</b> when the authors write "The increase in clay content of the affected gardens may be due to the <u>excess application of tank silt.</u>" They should explain about the application of tank silt – Why is it done? How could the authors know if the soil was submitted to application of tank silt? When the authors write "The EC was increased with increase in depth in both healthy and affected gardens of all the taluks which may be due to leaching off salts" it should be cited a reference?</li> <li>• When the authors write: "organic carbon contentment was medium to hight" they should indicate the value of the results and in which criteria a content of carbon is considered medium or hight.</li> <li>• In general, should be good show the tables with the result data before discussing then.</li> </ul> <p><b>Conclusion:</b> The relationship between the chemical differences observed in the soil of contaminated and health plants should be explored, considering what happens to the contaminated plant that can cause these modifications in adjacent soil.</p> <p>7. The references are not recent. There is no one reference from the last five years. In introduction there is a cited reference only at the first paragraph!</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>There are some small language mistakes, but it is possible to understand the idea.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>It is necessary to explore the relationship between the contamination of the plant with the soil's chemical modifications.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(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)</i>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Esther Maria Ferreira Lucas</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Centro Federal de Educação Tecnológica de Minas Gerais, Brazil</b>