

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_97305
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of different levels of microbial enriched biochar with fertilizer doses on soil properties and yield under Soybean (Glycine max) –Wheat (Triticum aestivum) cropping sequence
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)
<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. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. It could be benefit for scientific community (only if we see the raw data).</p> <p>2. Yes, the title is suitable. But we suggest to simplify (see the note in full text).</p> <p>3. a) It needs to be rewritten. b) The abstract did not write concisely and informative.</p> <p>4. The structure & subsection is general/ standard writing. However: a) The introduction: does not provide enough factual background. It also does not completely define a problem. The scope and justification of the work are not clear. b) Materials and Methods: - Do not give adequate information to allow the experiment to be reproduced. – Questionable method of data collection and analysis. c) Since the fact 4a & 4b, the Results are questionable. d) Results and Discussion: we suggest to present data in histogram (so that easier to view)</p> <p>5. It is scientifically correct [but it was more impressed trial and error. The limited data (no replicate) and poor discussion also lowering the quality of manuscript]</p> <p>6. References are sufficient (in number), but they should be re-checked since many typo. We also did not confirmed yet the cited part.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Yes, suitable English, and we believe a scholar can understand the grammatical content.	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>1. Author(s) are suggested read the General Guideline for Authors of this Journal. Especially for Material & Methods</p> <p>2. The high light or commented sentences are emphasized attention.</p> <p>3. Please check typo & grammatical.</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:	Rahmat Satoto
Department, University & Country	Indonesia