

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_125712
Title of the Manuscript:	IMPACT OF LEGUMINOUS ON THE STRUCTURE AND REPOPULATION OF SOIL ENGINEERS
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

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her
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	The article makes a strong contribution to the field of sustainable agriculture, particularly in resource-constrained environments like Korhogo. The findings regarding the role of <i>Cajanus cajan</i> in promoting soil macrofauna and improving soil structure are both scientifically robust and practically relevant.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	I suggest: "The Role of <i>Cajanus cajan</i> in Enhancing Soil Fertility and Macrofauna Populations in Intensively Cultivated Systems in Korhogo (Northern Côte d'Ivoire)	
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 provides a decent overview of the study, but there are several areas where it could be improved for clarity, completeness, and readability.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The manuscript appears to have a fairly logical structure, but there are a few areas where its organization and subsections could be improved for clarity, readability, and scientific rigor	
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.		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	While the current references are sufficient in terms of coverage, they can be strengthened with more recent global studies on soil fertility, macrofauna, tillage systems, and sustainable agriculture. Suggestions : 1.Lavelle, P., Blanchart, E., Martin, A., & Spain, A. V. (2021). "Soil macrofauna and ecosystem services: Key players in the soil system." <i>Pedobiologia</i> . 2.Sanginga, N., & Woomer, P. L. (Eds.). (2018). "Integrated Soil Fertility Management in Africa: Principles, Practices, and Developmental Process." <i>TSBF-CIAT</i> .	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	While the language is mostly understandable, the article requires revisions in grammar, sentence structure, and academic tone to meet the standards for scholarly communication.	
Optional/General comments	Based on the content of the manuscript, there do not appear to be any clear competing interest issues. However, to ensure transparency and maintain the integrity of the research, it would be prudent for the authors to include a " Competing Interests " or " Conflict of Interest " statement. No, there are not ethical issues.	

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Aissaoui Lynda
Department, University & Country	Ferhat Abbas University/SETIF, Algeria