

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_116059
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECT OF HUMIC ACID ON GROWTH, YIELD AND SOIL PROPERTIES IN RICE: A REVIEW
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>)

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><u>Compulsory</u> 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>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>No (The abstract is a jumble of sentences that repeat the same topics.)</p> <p>No (This paper does not have the structure of a standard scientific paper.)</p> <p>No (I find the paper scientifically incorrect because it cites two tables of results from several articles to prove the obvious.)</p> <p>Yes</p>	<p>I appreciate your feedback and I have revised the abstract to eliminate repetitive sentences and enhance coherence while ensuring clarity. I have highlighted the additional literature in yellow colour.</p> <p>I have restructured the paper to align with the standard format of a scientific review paper based on your feedback.</p> <p>I have revised the table by adding some additional information to the table. This is not an original research article, so to support the topic under review, information in the table was taken from cited research papers, which gives clarity about the topic. All the additional literature were highlighted in yellow colour.</p>
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>		

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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>	No