

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_106262
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Paper Mill Effluent Irrigation with or Without Compost Application on Root Nodulation and Soil Biology in Groundnut under Alfisols
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> <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.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. Yes!!!</p> <p>2. I suggest; "Effect of Paper Mill Effluent and Organic fertilizers on Root Nodules of groundnut and soil microorganisms in Alfisols of Tamil Nadu "</p> <p>3. In the abstract "abbreviations" should not be written, still it can be done but being written in words at their first mention; and else where in the text.</p> <p>4. Some Subsections are not appropriately placed in the manuscript, for example, the laboratory test of effluent irrigation water and initial soil properties should be taken to material and methods section rather than the Result section. The Result section also doesn't have any supportive discussions which may not be good</p> <p>5. The methods implemented are in a scientific manner, except that some explanatory things are missing from the manuscript, for example climate condition of the site, rate of irrigation applied, variety characteristics of the ground nut or its requirements.</p> <p>6. The references are not sufficient, the major reason for that could be there is no discussion in the result section. Most statements within the text are not cited. But most of references are in the acceptable range of recent publications.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The English/language quality in the introduction section is good, except the term Incessant written to suggest excess application of irrigation water. /Incessant = Excess/</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>It is very good to clear things that take readers in to doubt, and to write in the manner it can answers questions that can be raised by readers. Completeness on its own method is needed. That means under figure 2. two figures are put together and the first one is place as photos with their treatments, instead it would be good if the pictures have labels as root length or root volume.</p> <p>The tables in the result shows no significance level expressed by letters, or there is no the mean separation value as LSD of DMRT, etc. What is there the confidence limit and the standard error which may not help much to separate the best mean value among treatments.</p> <p>The conclusions are very short and not sufficient to summarize the results</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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Biruk Teshome
Department, University & Country	Asosa University, Ethiopia