

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Environment & Ecology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEE_122253
Title of the Manuscript:	A COMPARATIVE ASSESSMENT OF SOIL BIODIVERSITY AND PHYSICOCHEMICAL CHARACTERISTICS IN CONSERVATION AND CONVENTIONAL SMALLHOLDER FARMS IN KENYA.
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 (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 study assessed soil biodiversity and physicochemical properties of soils in 20 conservation and 20 conventional smallholder farms. Different farms with different locations works give differences among themselves.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Title must be short and concise.	
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.	Introduction of soil health reduce it to some extent.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
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.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Latitude degrees are given wrong, please correct it. - How many replications you have taken please write it. - CD values and SEM are to be include in results data. - References are too old. Please add latest references. 	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes references are sufficient but new references are too be add.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
Optional/General comments	NO	

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:	Navjot Rana
Department, University & Country	Lovely Professional University, India