

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_82417
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of groundwater quality for drinking and agriculture purposes in Al-Jouf Region, Saudi Arabia
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalijpss.com/index.php/IJPSS/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A large number of grammatical mistakes and errors in tense writing across the whole of the manuscript, is a major concern. - Even in the abstract, past and present tense are being used simultaneously. It is always better to use past tense as study has already been completed and you manuscript is now a write up of the findings which have already been made. - During writing the introduction part one must avoid the reporting of events by authors, e.g you have written that ??? reported same results in El- Khairat. It should be written such as...same results have been reported across the other part of the world also... and give reference. - At many instances you have written just the reference no in []. You are supposed to write the name of the author instead. - Describe the type of study - Rename the table captions accurately (parameters who standards) - Never write reference number in the name of a table ... refer to table 4 - Check the sequence of your tables. After table 4 you mention table 3. - In result section omit the write up of methodology part. - Discussion part needs more refinement on your results and then as documented by others. Discuss your results in a step wise manner so as to bring clarity. - In conclusion section, don't write the results. Conclude by writing the empirical outputs of your study. - Reference writing – follow a uniform pattern across all the references. 	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	<p>It seems that the write up part has not been rechecked by the author, leading to many grammatical mistakes across the whole manuscript.</p> <p>This is a very good study highlighting the water quality of a region. The clarity of results should be simple and visible to all. Try to write the result and discussion section in step wise manner to make these sections more clear and visible with scientific intent.</p>	

Review Form 1.6

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:	<i>Ajay Kumar Singh</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>India</i>