

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Journal of Pathogen Research</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPR_127200
Title of the Manuscript:	Analysis of Physiochemical Properties of dumpsite soil from federal University of Technology, Owerri (FUTO)
Type of the Article	Original Research 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

<b>Compulsory</b> 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.	As very little information is available from the reported region, the article may be useful to have an idea for the people interested in it. Again the study is unique and useful for management of city garbage and waste disposal.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Modified in the manuscript.	
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.	Yes. Suggested correction in the manuscript.	
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.	The author may avoid certain sentences which are known to all like definition of pH, importance of CEC etc. Further, units for the parameters (like available N, P, K, and CEC etc.) should be mentioned in the discussion part as well. The author should also be careful regarding use of upper and lower case of the alphabets. The subject of the topic is good and relevant and explained in a nice way.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	Yes. However, standard format should be used in citing the references.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, but could be improved.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The article may be considered for publication subject to incorporation of the modifications suggested in the body of the manuscript.	

### 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:	Mrinal Choudhury
Department, University & Country	SCS College of Agriculture, Assam Agricultural University, India