

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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>Proposed title- Impact of Paper Mill Effluent Irrigation on Groundnut Root Nodulation and soil enzymes for inclusion of Compost</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes, More description is required for figures and tables. Conclusion to be revised with numeric results.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>More recent references may be included.</p>																												
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes</p>																												
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Proposed title- Impact of Paper Mill Effluent Irrigation on Groundnut Root Nodulation and soil enzymes for inclusion of Compost</p> <p>Observations</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Sl No</th> <th>Contents</th> <th>Remarks</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1.</td> <td>Literature review</td> <td>Proper</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2.</td> <td>Novelty</td> <td>Satisfactory</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3.</td> <td>Objectives</td> <td>Good</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4.</td> <td>The contribution of the work to its scientific field clearly mentioned.</td> <td>Proper</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5.</td> <td>Results compared with results of related works published by other authors.</td> <td>More description is req figures and tables.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>6.</td> <td>The methodology</td> <td>Proper</td> </tr> <tr> <td>7.</td> <td>The paper formatted.</td> <td>Properly</td> </tr> <tr> <td>8.</td> <td>Conclusion</td> <td>Conclusion to be revised numeric results.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Sl No	Contents	Remarks	1.	Literature review	Proper	2.	Novelty	Satisfactory	3.	Objectives	Good	4.	The contribution of the work to its scientific field clearly mentioned.	Proper	5.	Results compared with results of related works published by other authors.	More description is req figures and tables.	6.	The methodology	Proper	7.	The paper formatted.	Properly	8.	Conclusion	Conclusion to be revised numeric results.	
Sl No	Contents	Remarks																											
1.	Literature review	Proper																											
2.	Novelty	Satisfactory																											
3.	Objectives	Good																											
4.	The contribution of the work to its scientific field clearly mentioned.	Proper																											
5.	Results compared with results of related works published by other authors.	More description is req figures and tables.																											
6.	The methodology	Proper																											
7.	The paper formatted.	Properly																											
8.	Conclusion	Conclusion to be revised numeric results.																											

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:	Chinmoy Kumar Panigrahi
Department, University & Country	KIIT Deemed to be University, India