

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_99467
Title of the Manuscript:	Studies on variations in physico-chemical, biochemical and biological characteristics at different maturity stages of segregated and unsegregated urban solid waste of drum compost
Type of the Article	Research

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> <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- Yes, it is. 2- The title is suitable 3- No is it not comprehensive (needs to be rewritten) 4- Yes, they are 5- Yes, but the authors need to do the required corrections. 6- References are very old and the authors need to use recent references.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The English language needs to be improved.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Abstract page 1, Lines 8-10. The sentence is not grammatically correct. It is not clear. Rewrite this sentence. Rewrite the Abstract to include two lines about the experimental program and procedure and the methods followed. Present some numbers or percentages from the results in the Abstract. Line 26: add a comma after "At present," Line 28: Grammar mistake Line 29: Add references to support the statement. Line 31: Spelling mistake "Theses" Lines 26-32: Add at least four references. Lines 34-38: Add references to support the statistic Line 38: correct the number. Line 40: How you use a reference dated 1999 to support current statistics. Lines 46-47: Use more recent references from the last 5 years. Line 47: Grammar mistake. Line 57: Grammar mistake. Line 61: Add the Country name after the City name. Line 71-77: How did you determine the microbial consortium? did you add the selected bacteria? or you have done isolation and characterization. Page 2: Line 71, add details about the drums (size, dimensions, made of) Page 8: Table 1, what were initial moisture, temperature, and bulk density at the start of the test. Page 8: Table 2, what were the initial pH, EC, OC, and C/N ratio at the start of the test. Page 9 – Lines 3-13 : What was the ambient temperature during the test period. Was the drum thermally isolated? What was the effect of ambient temperature on the test? Page 9- Line 32: Use a recent reference. Page 11: Table 3: What were the initial values of N, Pb, and K. Page 12: Table 4, What were the initial values of Ca, Mg, and S. Page 15: Lines 2-10 , use recent references. Page 19: line 41-42, rewrite the first sentence. What is the effect of the drum material on the process? It is not clear whether the process was aerobic or anaerobic? You have opened the drums after 20, 40, 60, and 80 days. What was the effect of that on the process.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

	Use recent references. Grammar and spelling check should be done thoroughly. Rewrite the Abstract Rewrite the conclusion.	
--	--	--

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:	Ikrema Hassan
Department, University & Country	University of New Brunswick, Canada