

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Pathogen Research
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: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript is crucial for understanding the impact of dumpsite contamination on soil quality, specifically at the Federal University of Technology, Owerri (FUTO). It provides valuable data on the physicochemical properties of soil, which is essential for assessing environmental risks and informing waste management strategies. The findings can serve as a reference for future studies on soil remediation and environmental health in urban and industrial settings.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	It is generally suitable, but it could be improved for clarity and specificity like "Physicochemical Analysis of Dumpsite Soil at the Federal University of Technology, Owerri (FUTO): Implications for Environmental Management."	
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 of the article is generally comprehensive, providing a clear overview of the study's aim, methodology, results, and conclusions. However, there are a few areas where it could be improved for clarity and conciseness, and some additional details might be useful, While the RESULTS provide important findings, some information might be presented more clearly. The results could be streamlined by emphasizing the main findings, such as, the study revealed significant differences in pH, nitrogen, potassium, and other soil properties between the dumpsite and control sites. The dumpsites exhibited higher pH, nitrogen, and potassium values compared to the control site, with increased cation exchange capacity and organic carbon levels.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The methods described, including pH measurement, conductivity, and CEC determination, are widely accepted techniques for assessing soil quality, making the study methodologically sound.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Several references are made to studies (e.g., [20], [21], [23], [25], [26], [27]), but the full citation details should be consistently provided. In scientific writing, it is essential to provide clear references for the reader to trace the original work. You may want to ensure that these citations are included in a bibliography or reference section at the end of the manuscript.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Satisfied	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The discussion should further highlight the broader environmental impact, such as how increased nutrient concentrations (like nitrogen and phosphorus) from dumpsites might affect surrounding ecosystems, particularly water bodies and agricultural land. Additionally, a more explicit connection to possible remediation or management strategies could make the conclusion stronger.	

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:	R. Suya Padhra Haridha
Department, University & Country	A.P.C. Mahalaxmi Collge For Women, India