



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2014_AJEA_13359
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparatives effectiveness of two vetiveria grasses species <i>Chrysopogon zizanoides</i> and <i>Chrysopogon nigritana</i> for the remediation of soil contaminated with heavy metals
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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	I have reviewed the manuscript 2014 AJEA 13359, and You will find my review below. It follows the Review Form which was sent. American Journal of Experimental Agriculture 2014 AJEA 13359 Comparative Effectiveness of two vetiveria grasses ... Original Research Article General Comment This manuscript reports on research with lead, zinc, and cadmium in four soils. Two grasses are grown in the soils. The original soils and the roots of the grasses are subjected to analysis to determine the metal concentrations. This manuscript is not scientifically robust and it is not technically sound. Further research is needed to have a useful manuscript. Part 1. Compulsory Revision Comments In lines 166-168, there is information about what	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	levels of metal contamination are phytotoxic to plants. These values are not all correct. The authors should review the literature further and improve the content of the manuscript here. The results in Table 4 show very good survival; this is a demonstration that the statement on lines 166-168 is not correct. In the abstract there are statements about the percentage reduction of metals in the soil, but there is no data on soil analysis to support these statements. Data is presented on the metals in the soil in Table 3, but there is no additional data to show what happens over time. This data needs to be added. The authors need to improve their review of the literature and their citations and references. There are several citations in the manuscript that do not have corresponding references. There are many prior plant studies on lead, zinc, and cadmium in soil that can be cited. The presentation in the manuscript needs to discuss the data that is reported. Any conclusions need to be supported by the data. Minor Revision Comments The English needs to be improved in many places, including the spelling of some words. Optional/General Comments	Corrections effected Corrections effected Corrections effected Corrections effected Corrections effected
--	--	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

	One of the important messages associated with this paper is that communities need to have proper waste management systems. Dumping of wastes on land needs to be prevented.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		