



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Soil Science and Plant Nutrition
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJSSPN_35624
Title of the Manuscript:	ASSESSMENT OF THE MICROBIAL POPULATIONS AND PHYSICOCHEMICAL COMPONENTS OF PARAQUAT TREATED SOIL
Type of the Article	Original Research Paper

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	PARAQUAT: Is a commercial name given to a chemical molecule. Although it might be commercially known as paraquat, I would expect to have it described in the introduction and on what does this chemical act. And why are you working on this specific chemical. You no mention of how did you characterise the microbes, I agree with microscopy, but I still think that is not enough. Could you please provide detail for isolate characterisation	
Minor REVISION comments	Line 17 not very clear Experimental design could be improved Was the experiment carried out in field? Was it in open air? How did you select the field. Was it a field which was treated with paraquat prior to this study? Please mention nutrient agar brand. Was the media sterelised prior to preparation? Line 156 : were Line 287: reference inconsistency	
Optional/General comments	First of all, let me say that it is a very good area of research, specially that now a lot of different chemicals are being applied to the soil and we clearly do not know what is happening to the microbiome. But I will surely recommend to do some major changes in the introduction and material&methods. More details and perspective of the study can be given. In introduction I clearly want to know the aim of this study Material and method could tell more about the location and the coordinates where this study has been carried out. As clearly this would also influence the microbiome and it will make it easier for another author to compare.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sillma Rampadarath
Department, University & Country	University of Mauritius, Mauritius