

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_123191
Title of the Manuscript:	Abundance and Diversity of Soil Macro-arthropods in the Arable Land of Cotton Zone: North-Cameroon
Type of the 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 <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 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.	Ecological work such as surveys to determine faunal diversity will always be relevant, especially now that we have a continuous flux in the macroclimates of determined collection sites.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Abundance is already accounted in the computation of H'. so I suggest this title: Diversity of Soil Macro-arthropods in the Arable Land of Cotton Zone: North-Cameroon	
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.	There are spotty grammar and misspelled words in the abstract. Please thoroughly check.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Materials and methods <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. As specimen collections were made, I require that a Permit coming from Environment and Natural Resources be acquired and showed here 2. Please site all keys, references, publications used in the identification of specimens in their particular taxa (Family, genera, species level) 3. I require that a certificate of specimen verification be acquired from experts to verify the identification of the specimens 4. The result sections should compare the diversity (H' and J) indices with other areas of the same breadth. 5. H' already computes for the species richness and relative abundance. I suggest to remove the computation of species richness and relative abundance 	
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.	There are technical issues at hand: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. As specimen collections were made, I require that a Permit coming from Environment and Natural Resources be acquired and showed here 2. Please site all keys, references, publications used in the identification of specimens in their particular taxa (Family, genera, species level) 3. I require that a certificate of specimen verification be acquired from experts to verify the identification of the specimens 	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =	Can the author highlight in their cited references the information they have cited? Eg. In North Cameroon and precisely in the northern part, nearly 53% of the land is intended for agriculture and the rest for protected areas and for mountains (Fok et al., 2019). – in what page did Fok et 2019, suggested that claim above. Do this for all references cited in the Introduction.	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	No. There are spotty grammar and misspelled words in the manuscript. Please thoroughly check.	
Optional/General comments		

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:	Anthony Ian G. Pag-Ong
Department, University & Country	Far Eastern University- Manila, Philippines