



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Agriculture and Ecology Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAERI_31862
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of simulated nitric and sulphuric acid rains on the nutrient content of <i>Amaranthus hybridus</i> L.
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	Lines 80 and 85: is it a new method? If not you are advised to indicate the authority. Line 93: Name the method involved. Lines 94 and 95: AAS was used following which method? Line 97: Name the method. Line 207: Results from related studies? Any similarity or deviation? Line 215: Possible reasons for the present findings? Line 236: Is it likely that there was increased mobility of some ions in soil too? Lines 235 – 239: Similar studies?	All corrected portions of this manuscript have been highlighted. All the reviewer's comments have been treated. This method is my method on individual simulated acid rain preparation. But spraying was carried out according to the method of Evans et al., 1981. Muhammad et al., 2014 used individual and a combination of acids.
Minor REVISION comments	Define abbreviations when used for the first time. Is that the acceptable format for an abstract? Before discussing about the importance of fibres, ash etc. explain findings of the present study Line 15: proximate minerals or proximate, minerals? Line 18: leaf, ash Line 22: 14.03 ± 0.01 mg/100g. Lines 69 – 70: Nitric and sulphuric acids ... Line 134: A. Hybridus	Have been treated. No, this is not the acceptable form of abstract presentation. The gaps have been bridged because abstract is presented in just a paragraph. 15 proximate, minerals, vitamins and antinutrients. Thank you reviewers for being thorough.
Optional/General comments		