

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_126614
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECT OF SLOPE GRADIENT ON SOIL PROPERTIES AND ORGANIC MATTER QUALITY IN AGGREGATE SIZE FRACTION ON COASTAL PLAIN SAND SOILS SOUTHEASTERN NIGERIA.
Type of the 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 manuscript addresses a topic that has been extensively studied, mainly in the laboratory, and yet there are gaps in field studies. Current times show that the loss of soil organic matter is one of the consequences of inadequate land management and it is necessary to understand the dynamics of this vital component of ecosystems and agroecosystems. It would be desirable to show images of the study area.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, it is.	
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.	Yes, it is.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, they are.	
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 well structured and the procedures well explained. In the section discussing the results, the results are compared with similar studies. The conclusions are consistent with the results.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes, they are.	
Minor REVISION comments	Yes, it is.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments		

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Juan Pulido-Secundino
Department, University & Country	Universidad Autonoma Chapingo, Mexico