



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Soil Science and Plant Nutrition</a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJSSPN_33653</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Iron Overload in the Root Environment of Rice (<i>Oryza sativa</i>- L) with a Miserable Nutrients Specification.</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

**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	<p><b>1. Description of how the experiment was carried out is extremely limited. So the experiment is not reproducibility.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No explanation of experimental design and treatment</li> <li>• Number of replication is not clearly defined</li> <li>• Total volume of Fe solution applied to the soil is not described clearly</li> </ul> <p><b>2. Table 1 is not found in the manuscript</b></p>	<p>1. In the Lines 78 &amp; 79, I like to draw the attention of <b>Experimental design "RBD", four different treatments vs +0 ppm, 100 ppm, 200 ppm &amp; 300 ppm. In Line 79 we are indicating four replications as "----- replicated four times----". 100 ml of above concentrations were added to the pots every after one week till the PI Stage.</b></p> <p>2. Sorry, the Table1 is space consuming &amp; omitted as two figs like "Figure 2" &amp; "Figure 3" are given to define the results.</p>
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p>1. Line 67 ...were studied... omit were</p> <p>2. Line 77 the sentence is ambiguous, consider rewritten</p> <p>3. Line 95 ... 1 gm... should be 1 g</p> <p>4. Y axis in Figure 1 should be pH instead of oH change</p> <p>5. Figures 1B, 1C, and 1D are not clear, consider re-drawn</p>	<p>1. Corrected</p> <p>2. Rewritten</p> <p>3. Corrected</p> <p>4. Sorry in Y axis, pH is already in the correct spelling</p> <p>5. Corrected by redrawing</p>
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The manuscript is written with good English. The author did not describe clearly the methodology of the research.	Thanks a lot.