

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_101968
Title of the Manuscript:	ASSESSMENT OF SOIL QUALITY INDICATORS OF SOIL FROM DIFFERENT DEPARTMENTS OF NAI, SHUATS, PRAYAGRAJ
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. They are of relevant importance, due to the content of soil samples, density, macro and micro nutrients. 2. The title is specific 3. It is complete. 4. They are of criteria and observation to the subject. 5. It is scientific and of impact to the study of soils, the information must be well written and citations conforming. 6. The references must have a total of 70% current and the rest that is relevant information to consider to cite in 30%.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Is correctly adequate	
Optional/General comments	Improve the writing and current citations of relevance, in addition to increasing bibliographic references since they do not exceed 20	

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:	Ricardo Augusto Luna Murillo
Department, University & Country	Universidad Técnica de Cotopaxi, Ecuador