



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Journal of Plant &amp; Soil Science</a>
Manuscript Number:	2014_IJPSS_14410
Title of the Manuscript:	USE OF COAL DERIVED HUMIC ACID AS SOIL CONDITIONER TO IMPROVE SOIL PHYSICAL PROPERTIES AND WHEAT YIELD
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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



**SDI 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Authors should work on the grammar (there were many paragraphs that difficult to understand).</li> <li>Treatments that performed best should be mentioned in the abstract.</li> <li>Why results deferred between the two grades of humic substances should be explained, including implications of one being better than the other.</li> <li>Objectives should be clarified.</li> <li>Materials and methods should be elaborated such that sections of materials, sampling and treatment application procedures, data analysis are clearly identified</li> <li>Statistical power of test goes down when number of treatments to be compared are high. Duncan's Multiple Range Test is not the right post-hoc test.</li> <li>The fact that adding organic materials to soil increases soil organic matter, aggregate stability, etc etc is a common knowledge (one does not have to do research to prove this). So, the study is not reporting new findings in this regard. So, the authors should focus on the effects of the applied materials on yield and growth parameters.</li> <li>Some more details are in the pdf copy of the MS</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Language has been tried to be improved.</li> <li>Abstract is modified.</li> <li>The reason has been incorporated.</li> <li>Objectives are modified</li> <li>Materials and methods are preferred by all the authors to be remained in the same format because it was a field trial.</li> <li>LSD was applied to compare the means.</li> <li>The order of results and discussion is changed and tried to re write as suggested, yes fact is there but there still need to explore the new organic sources potential that's why study was conducted.</li> <li>All the changes of PDF copy has been incorporated.</li> </ul>
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		