

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_97442
Title of the Manuscript:	Impact of Biotic Stress on Physiochemical Properties of Soil at Doodhpathri of Kashmir Valley
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>)

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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Importance: The authors studied the forest soil of Doodhpathri in Kashmir in the spring and summer seasons at three sites (forest, meadow, and deforested sites) in the year 2019. They evaluated soil texture, pH, electrical conductivity (EC), moisture, organic carbon (OC), available macronutrients (Nitrogen, Potassium, Phosphorus, Calcium, and Magnesium), and heavy metals (Copper, Nickel, Cadmium, Manganese, Lead, and Zinc). 2. Title: Clear to a greater extent but preferred to be modified into "Impact of Biotic Stress on Physiochemical Properties of Soil at Doodhpathri Kashmir". 3. Abstract: Improperly displayed. Please provide one or two short sentences as a background on the problem before illustrating the aim. Some modifications were recommended to enhance the readability and understanding. 4. Structure of the manuscript: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Keywords: Not listed. b. Introduction: Improperly displayed in two large paragraphs. The introduction has to be re-arranged into only three paragraphs i.e. 1. Introduction 2. Significance of the study, and 3. Aim of the study. Some modifications were suggested to enhance readability and understanding. c. The aim: Not listed. The aim has to be illustrated in details by the end of the introduction section. d. Materials and methods: Please notice the following: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No ethical approval and considerations were provided. 2. The authors did not provide the exact number of the samples collected. 3. The authors did not provide the detailed statistical analysis section, as well as a reference or the analysis should be provided and the statistical model used. 4. Many modifications were suggested to enhance the readability and understanding of the text. e. Results: Novel but avoid the repetition of the numbers as they are in the tables. The level of significance was not listed at all. Many modifications that were suggested to enhance the readability and understanding of the text. f. Discussion: Clear to a certain extent with moderate comparison and speculation. Many modifications were suggested to enhance the readability and understanding of the text. g. Conclusion: Clear and informative. Many modifications were suggested to enhance the readability and understanding of the text. h. Tables: Well-presented and organized. i. Figures: Well-presented and organized. 5. Scientific Soundness: The manuscript emphasized a good idea but was expressed poorly and in redundant way. 6. References: MUST BE UPDATES as ZERO% (0 out of 40) of the listed references were published in the past five years. The percentage has to be increased to 30-40% at least. Old references give an indication of the lower value of the research and that this point is no longer a point off interest. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>General view: The manuscript was expressed in poor English and grammar. Serious and professional copyediting and proofreading have to be carried out before resubmission to achieve the publishing value.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Essam Samir Soliman
Department, University & Country	Suez Canal University, Egypt