

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_104551
Title of the Manuscript:	Paper Mill Effluent is an Alternate for Irrigation and Nutrient Sources in Improving Soil Health and Agricultural Productivity
Type of the Article	Review 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 1.7

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>L = Line</p> <p>Abstract</p> <p>L17: "So we can..." -> Don't use "we", be impersonal.</p> <p>Introduction</p> <p>L27: "lakh" -> ???</p> <p>L33: "[1].The" -> space missing</p> <p>L33: give the meaning of the abbreviations BOD and COD</p> <p>L35: "higher[2]." -> another space missing. Check for missing spaces throughout the entiretext.</p> <p>L39: "1.1 Pulp and paper industry history" -> Is this section part of the introduction or isit the Review itself? Do not subdivide the introduction into subsections.</p> <p>L72: "most polluting industries[6])." -> paragraph leftL78:</p> <p>"manomeric" -> ??? monomeric?</p> <p>Table 1: "Tannins ,resin acids" -> check space left</p> <p>-> Table 1 was not referenced in the text.</p> <p>L91: "1.4 PAPER PRODUCTION PROCESS " -> this section should be before section 1.3</p>	<p>Revised as reviewer's comment</p>

Review Form 1.7

	<p>-> Section numbering is not following a formatting pattern. Section 1.3 is in lowercase,section 1.4 is in uppercase. Check for proper formatting and numbering of sections.</p> <p>Figure 1: "Figure 1 was not explained. The process steps shown in the flowchart in Figure1 should be explained."</p> <p>L100: "Wastewater treatment methods" -> is this title a subsection of section 1.4?Confused. Verify proper numbering of all sections and subsections.</p> <p>L101-L109: References?</p> <p>L108: "waste water" -> wastewater?</p> <p>L109: "E (P) Act 1986 " -> what does it mean?</p> <p>L101-144 and L146-182: the text should be explanatory without the use of markers.L163:</p> <p>"forms ([13])." -> paragraph</p> <p>L166: "(Peng Wang et al. 2008)" -> The citation of references was in the form of numbers,why is this line author/year in parentheses?</p> <p>L190-201: missing references.</p> <p>L198-199: format chemical formulas</p> <p>Table 3 -> The formatting of the first line should be different from the others. Aren'tchemical elements supposed to be in ionic form?</p> <p>The unit (ppm) should be specified on the first line and not in the footer.</p> <p>L207: "of the crop (Table 3)." -> Table 3 or Table 4?</p>	
--	---	--

Review Form 1.7

	<p>Table 6: Confused. What does “1. Total porosity [39]” mean?</p> <p>Symbols for chemical elements should be in the corresponding ionic forms. Table</p> <p>7: “kg ha⁻¹” -> Format.</p> <p>Figure 2: I see no need for a three-dimensional graph. The graph could be two-dimensional. The unit (%) is missing on the Y-axis.</p> <p>-> some general aspects of the text need to be improved: sequence and organization of sections, some explanations presented very succinctly in the form of tables making it difficult to understand.</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>L272: “Now a days” ->??? Nowadays?</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		Ok
1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Minor correction is required.	
Optional/General comments	Must follow author's guideline.	Ok

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>	