

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Journal of Soil Science and Plant Nutrition</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJSSPN_112894</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>THE IMPACTS OF ABATTOIR WASTES ON SOIL QUALITY AT UKWUNWANGWU, UTURU, ABIA STATE, NIGERIA</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Observational Research Article</b>

## 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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li><b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li><b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li><b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<p><b>Though the present work needs some more elaboration of presented data and parameters, but it definitely is important for scientific community as it mentions the effect of abattoir wastes on the soil quality and we know that the soil quality is dependent on the kind of work or environment around it e.g., industrial effluents and polluted air and water also can affect the soil quality.</b></p> <p><b>Title can be changed to 'IMPACT OF ABATTOIR WASTES ON SOIL QUALITY AT UKWUNWANGWU, UTURU, ABIA STATE, NIGERIA' rather than starting with 'THE IMPACTS...'</b></p> <p><b>Yes, the abstract is comprehensive itself, however the manuscript needs to be improved accordingly.</b></p> <p>Yes, all the sections are appropriate and arranged in a proper order.</p> <p>Yes, scientifically, the methods used in the present study are correct.</p> <p>The references seem to be very old except a one or two. There is a need to include some recent references at least of past 3-5 years. If the authors include some data from any report e.g., UNESCO 2006 or say EPA reports, then try to include the most recent data and also add the proper explanation based on that.</p> <p>Some additional points to be improved:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is a strict need to elaborate the findings in words, the authors should not just illustrate the outcomes in graph format only but they should elaborate their findings elaborating the possible reasons for the found data and also include how the findings are correlated with the profound literature on the present area of study.</li> <li>The conclusion of the manuscript should include the major findings of the study, instead of just a simple discussion and suggestions on the administrative levels.</li> <li>There should be a separate explanation for comparison of the samples collected from the sites and Control A and Control B samples. There is a specific role of control in a particular comparative study and the results should be discussed by taking them into consideration.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></li> </ol>	<p>English is of moderate level with very less amount of typo errors and grammatical mistakes. E.g., to represents milli litre, the authors should use mL not ml; min not minutes; in pH there is no need to write H on the superscript of p, instead just use p in small letter and H in capital letter.</p> <p><b>In section 2.4.1.1 DETERMINATION OF (<math>p^H</math>): HYDROGEN ION CONCENTRATION</b>, there is a sentence ' they were shook for 30 mins...' there should be shaken instead of shook. The manuscript has a few other minute grammatical errors as above, so it is advised to the authors to go through the manuscript once more to eliminate those mistakes.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>-</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<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>Ankita Negi</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>CSIR-Indian Institute of Petroleum, India</b>