



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	➤ The author(S) should stick to the journal's referencing format and use numbers rather than names in making citations. The references should be numbered according to how they are cited in the main text. ➤ Section 3.9 is not very clear, mostly lines 185 (The application of paraquat doses was? at the 2nd WAA recorded the most effective action) and 188 (The control, also was? at the 2nd WAA had the most effective action with 7.52 %.....). Moreover, pH does not have any unit, so I find it difficult to understand what the researcher (s) meant by:..... recorded the most effective action with 7.39 %, 7.49 % and 7.49 % respectively The researcher failed to provide the baseline values (The initial condition of the soil before treatment with paraquat), I therefore find it difficult to extrapolate the level or degree of effect when the initial condition is not known. The author no doubt had a control but this control (from 2nd – 8th WAA) does not indicate the pristine state at week 0, before application.	
Minor REVISION comments	✓ In line 201, Similarly should be corrected to Similar. ✓ Section 2.3 is not clear at all, most especially, lines 77 and 78. Please, rephrase and use more words to make your points better understood. ✓ It is also important to make your prospective readers understand the concentrations that define paraquat low dose (PLD), paraquat recommended dose (PRD), paraquat high dose (PHD), as used in line 124.	
Optional/General comments	- This is an interesting research topic - The research paper contains findings that are very critical. However, the researcher did not find enough time to give detailed analysis as well as discussion.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Tonye Sampson
Department, University & Country	Department of Microbiology, University of Port Harcourt, Nigeria