

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_120312
Title of the Manuscript:	High density soil survey of CRC -1 by the use of laboratory methods
Type of the Article	

Review Form 3

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>
Please write few sentences regarding the importance this manuscript for scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript is indeed relevant to the scientific audience and this is the more reason why it should undergo a serious review. The manuscript is not scientifically correct in its current condition. It contains a lot of scientific inconsistencies and discontinuities that need to be addressed.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The is not suitable and therefore needs some modifications.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract of the article is not comprehensive. It lacks a brief background of topic, aim of study, conclusion and recommendations.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The subsections and structure of the manuscript have so much of inappropriateness. It has some relevant subsections/subheading that were omitted. The author(s) may need to reconcile these subsections.	
Please write few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript lacks the quality that can qualify it as a full-length paper. However, if it fits the journal to accept it for publication, then I am suggesting that it should be accepted as a "Short Communication".	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. =	The references are not sufficient and some are not recent. The number of references is scanty. This could be the reason why the author(s) could not have been able to present a good justification of the trend of results obtained in this study.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	No. There is so much use of ambiguous words. The quality is poor and there are so many grammatical errors and discontinuities in several cases. This manuscript requires thorough English editing.	
Optional/General comments	It appears that the manuscript must undergo serious major revision before it can be considered for publication. I also think that the author(s) require some kind of academic mentoring/coaching to improve their level of applicability of scientific concepts and theories to identifying research gaps. The author(s) did not discuss the results and therefore the discussion is completely mission in this manuscript.	

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>	No ethical issues in this manuscript.

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Denis M. K. Amara
Department, University & Country	Njala University, Sierra Leone