

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.		
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)		
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.		
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?		
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.		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.		

Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>Abundance and Diversity of Soil Macro-arthropods in the Arable Land of Cotton Zone: North-Cameroon</p> <p>General Comments</p> <p>The structure of the text is unique, but it requires more research orientation to match the quality standards of International Journal of Plant & Soil Science. Eliminate unnecessary words that are irrelevant to the research topic. Comprehensive, and careful proofreading of the entire manuscript must meet the standards of the journal. Several language-related errors, sentence framing, and paragraph formation were examined as misleading. Avoid general statements and make concrete statements, as these reflect a question mark on the quality work. The right choice of words, and an in-depth critical evaluation of the work are required in each section.</p> <p>Specific Comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">✘ Title of the manuscript is quite scientific and impressive.✘ Abstract lacks scientific description and should be reframed within 200 words. Kindly check the year “consecutive years 2028-2019.”✘ Keywords are imperative but shouldn't be confined to the manuscript title alone. These keywords describe title of the manuscript, not the entire study.✘ Introduction is good; however, try to avoid long sentences such as 4 liners or 5 liners. Citations are sufficient to support the study. The purpose of the study is missing, which means that why you have chosen this study. The objective should be included in the abstract instead of the introduction.✘ Materials and Methods are very comprehensive and perfectly described. Figure 1: latitudes and longitudes are missing, and without them, any map can't be authenticated. Kindly check the area “approximately 85.000 km².” Avoid using citations in materials and methods section until and unless, the study can't be completed without their use.✘ Results and Discussion tables and figures are explained very well to achieve the desired outcomes. Include pictures of collected soil macro-arthropods to further validate the study. Avoid using citations in this section. Please check the data “Formicidae number 13.457 species”. Only tables and bar diagrams are not sufficient to present the quality research. Include additional maps,	

Review Form 3

	<p>pie charts, trend lines, flow diagrams, and other features to enhance the overall quality. A mere description indicates the vague research instead of quality research. A detailed critical analysis of the collected data is appreciated, and appropriate terminology and words enhance the quality of the work.</p> <p>✍ Conclusion is perfectly described. However, you may choose to mention additional studies for further clarification briefly.</p> <p>✍ References follow uniformity in the adopted referencing style. Correct the statement “n°11; 1991, pp.127-138.” The same kind of error is found in several references. Author (s) cited all the references cited in this study. Many of them are current research works from diverse domains, hence enhancing the overall quality.</p> <p>A concrete justification of the study can be helpful in the research arena. A minor revision of the manuscript is required.</p>	
--	--	--

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:	Shahid Jamal
Department, University & Country	University of Delhi, India