

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_118508
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of Physico-chemical Properties of Soil from Different Blocks of Namchi district of Sikkim, India
Type of the Article	

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://journaljabb.com/index.php/JABB/editorial-policy>)

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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Somehow the manuscript is important to scientific community especially in the field of agriculture. But the data shown only a minimal information. 2. Yes title is suitable to the article 3. NO, the abstract need to be improved more. 4. Yes the subsections are appropriate but the subsections in the methods should be improved. 5. Yes scientifically correct 6. Reference are not sufficient and need major improvement. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>Yes the language is suitable for scholarly communication</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>This manuscript should have a serious major revision. The introduction is poorly written. The background of the was not presented well. No objective was provided, and the reason for the need to conduct this study was in the sampling area. The author fails also to present the significance of their study.</p> <p>The method section is also poorly written. The map should be presented formally. A description of the sampling area should be presented well before presenting the sampling technique.</p> <p>Results and discussions are poorly written. The presentation of the results should be written well to highlight the most important outcome of the study. Using a table is also important in highlighting the results, but the table seems confusing; the figures are also confusing because it seems the information in the tables and the figures shows similar data. The author must decide if they choose the table or the figure only.</p> <p>The discussion was also written poorly. No discussion was presented; the author just merely wrote the word "like the study of – et al. This part should present a comparison from other studies to validate their claims of their results.</p> <p>The Conclusion also needs to be re-written so focus on answering your study's objectives if it was achieved in your experimentation. You can also add recommendations as an ending statement of your conclusion sections.</p> <p>The reference section also needs to be rewritten; some information is lacking in the reference of the cited journal, such as journal name, vol, and page number; even the study's title is missing.</p> <p>Thus, the reviewer suggests that the author should revise the whole manuscript.</p> <p>And to the editor, this manuscript should be published, after the comments and suggestions given by the reviewer will be followed and satisfied.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Florence Jhun f. Almadin
Department, University & Country	Caraga State University, Philippines