

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Archives of Current Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ACRI_112246
Title of the Manuscript:	Soil quality assessment of sesame-growing soils with different productivity in the Northern Telangana Zone, India
Type of the Article	

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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. Yes.</p> <p>2. Very suitable and informative.</p> <p>3. The abstract is comprehensive. The author needs to work on the sentences to reduce redundancy and improve coherence.</p> <p>4. Subsections are okay. The author has cited old publications. However, improve citations from 2018 to 2023 to make the work so latest.</p> <p>5. The manuscript is scientifically correct. I would appreciate it if the authors worked on the grammatical errors.</p> <p>6. Some references are quite old e.g. 2003, 2005, 1971. A lot has been done on Soil quality to refer to e.g. Hazelton et al. 2018, Mulugeta et al. 2021 among others.</p> <p>7. The conclusion sounds like a summary of the research. The conclusion should be based on the finding and their implications.</p> <p>8. The introduction should contain the intent of the study/aim/objective and the gap you are attempting to fill.</p> <p>N:B. Refer to comments in the manuscript</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>1. English is poor; however, the authors need to improve it through peer reviewing and the use of software e.g., Grammarly, Quilbot among others. Avoid short sentences.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>2. The research was well executed, and the data analysis is well done.</p>	

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:	Petros Chavula
Department, University & Country	Haramaya University, Ethiopia