



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	2014_IJPSS_12807
Title of the Manuscript:	<i>Puccinellia chinampoensis</i> Ohwi shows high selectivity of K^+, Ca^{2+} and Mg^{2+} over Na^+ in the rhizosphere of sodic soil
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	There are a lot of spacing issues throughout the manuscript. Also, several tense issues are found (i.e. line 49). A native English speaker should read through the manuscript to check. I could tell that different people wrote different sections of the manuscript, so there was some lack in cohesiveness.	Thank you for your kind comments to my manuscript. Maybe this space issue was happened when the manuscript file was submitted via internet. I corrected all words without spaces. Thank you for your minor revision comments to correct manuscript English. I corrected our manuscript English and contents following your instructions. And the other reviewers also instructed correction of our manuscript English and contents. So I also corrected our manuscript following the other reviewer instructions. Our manuscript was corrected English by native English speaker. Therefore, our manuscript English was revised thanks to many English instructions. I am happy when you read revised manuscript.
Minor REVISION comments	Write out the names of each element in the introduction so the readers know what each element is. Lack of consistency in maintaining the charges of the elements (i.e lines 287-305). Add in general information about the study species. Why were the other grass species chosen? Methods are unclear/too general (i.e. how much soil was collected, how was the soil collected, how many pots were used in the growth chamber experiment, what size, did/how did randomization/replication occur, how many pots per species, how many seeds per pot, why was the experiment terminated after 2 months, how large were the plants at time of termination, how was the field site prepared?, etc.).	Write out the names of each element in the introduction so the readers know what each element is. → I wrote out the names of each element in introduction following your advice. Lack of consistency in maintaining the charges of the elements (i.e lines 287-305). → I corrected the lack of consistency in maintaining the charges of the elements. i.e. when Na means element, I write without the charges of Na such as Na content. And when Na means ion, I write with the charge of Na such as exchangeable Na ⁺ . Add in general information about the study species. Why were the other grass species chosen? → I added the information about the plants and the reason why the plants were chosen in Materials and methods. Methods are unclear/too general (i.e. how much soil was collected, how was the soil collected, how many pots were used in the growth chamber experiment, what size, did/how did randomization/replication occur, how many pots per



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>Add in F and P values in all figures and standard errors in tables 1-2. The discussion sections over uses the word "it" which makes it hard to follow what exactly "it" is that is being referred to. Line 307 and 310 are redundant. More citations are needed (ex. Line 337- who suggested?)</p>	<p>species, how many seeds per pot, why was the experiment terminated after 2 months, how large were the plants at time of termination, how was the field site prepared?, etc.). → I added the information about methods following your advice. (i.e. lines 98-104).</p> <p>Add in F and P values in all figures and standard errors in tables 1-2. → I added in F and P values in all figures and standard errors in tables 1-2.</p> <p>The discussion sections over uses the word "it" which makes it hard to follow what exactly "it" is that is being referred to. Line 307 and 310 are redundant. More citations are needed (ex. Line 337- who suggested?) → I corrected our manuscript to understand easily following advices of you and the other reviewer.</p>
Optional/General comments	<p>Well written. Interesting concept. Is it necessary to show Fig 5 and 6 a/b since there was no significant difference? The authors can just state this in the results section. Reword the sentences that say: "The results of X are in Table Y." Move lines 361-364 to end of conclusion section.</p>	<p>Thank you very much for your kind advice to our manuscript. I think that it is necessary to show Fig. 5 and 6. Before correction our manuscript, I am sorry that it was a little difficult to understand the means of Fig. 5 and 6. I wanted to compare the K content difference of <i>P. chinampoensis</i> between growin on sodc soil and alkaline soil. Though the amount of exchangeable K⁺ of alkaline soil was higher than that of sodic soil, the K level of <i>P. chinampoensis</i> grown in the alkaline soil was one-tenth of that of the sodic soil. We think this result is interesting and meaningful information. Therefore, we think it is necessary to show Fig. 5 and 6.</p> <p>Reword the sentences that say: "The results of X are in Table Y." → I corrected this place following advices of you and the other reviewers as "The results of the levels of Na, K, Ca and Mg per shoot dry weight of each plant are shown in Figures 2a, 2b, 2c, and 2d."</p> <p>Move lines 361-364 to end of conclusion section. → I moved it to the end of conclusion section.</p>

Note: Modification was done in this document ONLY to hide some comments, which are against the SDI peer review guidelines.