

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_85571
Title of the Manuscript:	IMPACT ASSESSMENT OF SOIL PARAMETERS AFFECTED BY GAS FLARING IN TEA GARDEN IN DIBRUGARH DISTRICT OF ASSAM, INDIA
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>The abstract need to be reorganized according to the remarks made in the manuscript. The structuring of sentences in the introduction needs to be readjusted. The section related to Material and methods need to be completely rephrased. In the section dealing with Results and Discussions, the Author needs to improve the structuring of the sentences. In the same vein, he must gainfully build up short sentences. This will surely make easier the understanding of his manuscript. The results can be better commented. The discussion of the results must be completely resumed.</p> <p>Moreover, I don't think that the name of the authors cited must appear in the text; the use of numbers can be done for that purpose. Then in the references, those numbers can be respectively associated with the author indexed. This will have the advantage to lighten the manuscript.</p> <p>I finally have the impression that the present manuscript was written with too much precipitation, with as for consequences the shortcomings observed. I advice the author to come down and reconsider it deeply because the results he obtained are interesting according to my way of seeing things.</p> <p>I have nothing to say about the references.</p> <p>NB: *In the results and discussion part, one may gainfully start by presenting a given result with reference to figures or/and tables if possible. After this, its analysis must be done in relation to itself first, then in relation to the other results obtained in the same field by other researchers to be cited. At the end, an interpretation is done in order to justify the result obtained. While doing this, links can be created when possible between one's results; for instance: the concentration of nitrogen in soils is consistent with the plant firmness</p> <p>*Furthermore, The results and discussion part of a manuscript represents the contribution of the author in the improvement of the scientific knowledge in a given field. You have pertinent results. However, the way they are presented is really questionable. I suggest you to reorganize them, properly discuss and interpret them.</p>	<p>Corrected and highlighted.</p> <p>The sentences were written in short in original manuscript but i don't know why the sentences got joined in the revised manuscript.</p>
Minor REVISION comments	<p>The idea developed in this study agrees perfectly with the concept of the sustainable development. The results are relevant. But, the author may gainfully rephrase the sentences and readjust the punctuation for a final manuscript digestible for the scientific community.</p> <p>The Author must clearly indicate why he decided to carry the study and, at the end, he must clearly list his findings in the conclusion.</p>	<p>Corrected and highlighted</p>
Optional/General comments	<p>The idea is good. The results are interesting. But the manuscript needs readjustments.</p>	<p>Corrected and highlighted</p>

Review Form 1.6

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