

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_121057
Title of the Manuscript:	PHYSICAL AND CHEMICAL PROPERTIES OF SOIL OF DIFFERENT VILLAGES OF DISTRICT SOLAN, HIMACHAL PRADESH
Type of the Article	Original article

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The paper lacks the importance of the study or why was the study conducted? If the soil analysis was already conducted by Kumar <i>et al.</i> , (2023 & Tiwari <i>et al.</i> , (2023).	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Title is OK	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	It is not comprehensive because it lacks statement of the problem or the reason for conducting the study.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	It is appropriate.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript is not correct because of the following reasons. 1) The style of result and discussion is the same throughout the section. 2) The confidence level and ANOVA table are not given 3) The same result is shown by table and figure. This is wrong. Results should be shown either by table or by figure.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =	sufficient	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	It is ok. But in some paragraphs re-writing is required.	
Optional/General comments		

Review Form 3

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:	Tesfalem Weldeslassie Ghebretnsae
Department, University & Country	Hamelmalo Agricultural College, Eritrea