

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Journal of Biochemistry Research &amp; Review</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJBCRR_127151
Title of the Manuscript:	EVALUATION OF PRESUMED DROUGHT IMPACTED SOILS THROUGH PHOSPHOLIPID FATTY ACID (PLFA) BIOMARKERS
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

#### PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<b>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.</b>	This manuscript is important for the scientific community because it studies how drought affects soil microbes, which is crucial for soil health and farming, especially in dry regions like the Sahel. By using PLFA biomarkers, the study shows how drought changes the balance of microbes in the soil, which can impact soil fertility and nutrients. I appreciate that this study focuses on an important issue, especially with climate change increasing droughts.	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	Yes, the title of the article is suitable. It clearly reflects the study's focus on evaluating drought-impacted soils through the use of PLFA biomarkers	
<b>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.</b>	The abstract is mostly complete, explaining the study's purpose, methods, and main findings. It would be better if it included some specific results, like how much the microbial groups or nutrients changed due to drought. Adding one line about why these findings are important for soil health and farming in dry areas would also improve it.	
<b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>	Yes, the subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate. Each section is well-organized, allowing for a clear understanding of the study's purpose, methods, results, and conclusions.	
<b>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.</b>	The manuscript is scientifically correct because it follows a proper research method to study how drought affects soil microbes. The authors use PLFA biomarkers, which is a reliable technique to measure microbial changes in soil. The data collection and analysis are clearly described, making the results trustworthy. Overall, the study is thorough and gives useful information on how drought impacts soil health in dry regions.	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b> :-	The manuscript includes a sufficient number of references, many of which are recent and relevant to the study's focus on drought impacts on soil microbial communities using PLFA biomarkers. However, incorporating additional recent studies could further strengthen the literature review. For instance, the article "Adaptation to chronic drought modifies soil microbial community responses to wet-up" (2021) discusses how prolonged drought conditions alter soil microbial communities, which is pertinent to your research.  Additionally, the review "Phospholipid fatty acid profiling of microbial communities—a review of interpretations and recent applications" (2015) provides insights into the use of PLFA analysis in studying microbial communities. Including such references would provide a more comprehensive context for your study.	

### Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments <b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Yes, the language and English quality of the article are suitable for scholarly communications.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The data is well-presented through figures and tables, but adding a few explanatory notes to Figure 1 would help readers interpret the scatter plots more easily.	

### **PART 2:**

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

### **Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Roshni V</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Copperbelt University, Zambia</b>