

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_123691
Title of the Manuscript:	Vetiver (<i>Chrysopogon zizanioides</i> (L.) Roberty) – an aromatic root crop for soil and water conservation
Type of the Article	Review article

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

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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.	This manuscript is important considering the great contribution of Vetiver in soil conservation. The article provides current development in utilizing Vetiver for soil remediation due various human activities such as mining and other activities that released toxic waste to the environment.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The content of the article very relevant with the field of the journals.	
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.	The abstract has reflected the summary of the overall literature study.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	In general, the structure and subsection of the manuscript is appropriate. However, it needs to be supported with the methods used in searching the references and the criteria for acceptance and rejection.	
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.	The information described in the manuscript is correct, since is collected from the references published. Many important and novel information from this review can be further studied to gain more detail understanding on the observed data. Furthermore, some of the important information can be developed to solve the problem with waste and contamination.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Most references reviewed published after 2000, but there is one article published in 1993.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The English has been suitable for scientific communication.	
Optional/General comments	The author needs to describe the method used for searching the references, key words used and the criteria for acceptance and rejection of the references.	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sukrasno
Department, University & Country	Institut Teknologi Bandung, Indonesia