



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_39328
Title of the Manuscript:	Standardizing row spacing of vetiver for river bank stabilization of lower Ganges
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>)

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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	i) Sentence restructuring needs to be done to correct the grammar in several sections of the paper. ii) The author has not explained why root length was consistently higher in 75 cm row spacing. It is prudent that an explanation is given as to why we observe this trend. iii) The vetiver height was measured as one of the key parameters but its linkage to soil and water conservation or stabilization of the river bank cannot be traced anywhere in the paper. iv) The runoff for the barren sites should be presented in Fig. 2A for comparison and assessment of treatment contribution v) Conclusion on nutrient depletion may be too early because the grass is perennial and has not yet littered to provide for recycling of the nutrients. Unless the grass is harvested for other uses, the conclusion should have been followed with a recommendation for longer term studies. vi) The recommendation for government to promote vetiver as a cost effective bio-engineering tool contradicts with the nutrient requirement as presented in lines 210-215. Unless the quoted figures are of total soil nitrogen, the figures are extremely high.	i) Done as per suggestion. ii) The necessary explanation was given as per suggestion. iii) We completely agreed with this statement. According to the recommendation, we have included one correlation figure between soil conservation efficiency and plant height of vetiver. iv) The runoff for the barren sites has presented in Fig. 2A for comparison and assessment of treatment contribution. v) Yes, the study we have reported in this paper is initial one. We agreed that perennial nature of Vetiver, in long run, will increase the soil fertility status by addition of organic litter and recycling of nutrients. The statement in this context was also modified accordingly. vi) Yes, govt. can promote vetiver as a cost effective bio-engineering tool. We have recommended some organic inputs in initial period of establishment of this crop for good growth and root development. But at latter stage no fertilizer supply is required. The necessary correction in the manuscript is done accordingly.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The key words should not be picked from the ones that already appear in the title.	The key words were modified as suggested.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		