



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Journal of Plant &amp; Soil Science</a>
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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>PuccinelliachinampoensisOhwi ,Generic name in italics and should be separated (genus and species).          .Title should not be conclusion of study if possible author should rephrase the title,          Title shows ...space ,sodic soil ...space          Abstract .Sodic and alkaline soil...          In the cultivation...delete it.Directly start sentence in artificial soil....          Which other plants were used in study?????whole abstract should be rechecked for space between words.L19-25 should be checked for space between words.L25 Raised to 10.</p>	<p>Thank you for your kind comments to my manuscript.          I was really surprised that spaces disappeared. 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 corrected our manuscript following the other reviewer instructions. Our manuscript was also 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.</p> <p>PuccinelliachinampoensisOhwi ,Generic name in italics and should be separated (genus and species).          → I separated and corrected the word.</p> <p>.Title should not be conclusion of study if possible author should rephrase the title,          Title shows ...space ,sodic soil ...space          → I corrected the title following your advice. Thank you.</p> <p>Abstract .Sodic and alkaline soil...          In the cultivation...delete it.Directly start sentence in artificial soil....          → I corrected these parts following your advice.</p> <p>Which other plants were used in study?????whole abstract should be rechecked for space between words.L19-25 should be checked for space</p>



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

	<p>L35 has been facing L42 high palatability ...space L49 recovering of vegetation L53,55 characteristics L55 A complete study about characteristics of.....L57 so the focus of this study was to understand the uptake of... L64.without sodification. As for we know ...delete it.L66 nutrient uptake ...L55.56 and67,68,,repetition of same claim. L76 the site from where soil was collected... L122...Into two parts and each part was 9....Square measures. L140 In growth chamber under control conditions???? Temperature,humidity,atmospheric pressure,light intervals????L142 Table 1.....In this experiment.delete full sentence L155.showed L167 showed Table 1,Chemical properties of the sodic and artificial soil.L167-170 IF POSSIBLE PLS Add how much highest and how much lowest value from control. L198.The chemical properties of experimental soil has been presented in table 2.L205 fertile soil... L207.The shoot dry weight of L. chinensis was significantly 208 higher than that of P. chinampoensis( Fig 4).L262 good germination ability.L264 to its survival.Further investigation could help to reach the conclusion..L279.Add recent reference to support the claim.L305 add reference to support the results. L333,it is shown ???Table or Fig?????L372 Data indicated L338 Na tolerant....</p>	<p>between words.L25 Raised to 10. L35 has been facing L42 high palatability ...space → I corrected these parts following your advice. L49 recovering of vegetation L53,55 characteristics L55 A complete study about characteristics of.....L57 so the focus of this study was to understand the uptake of... L64.without sodification. As for we know ...delete it.L66 nutrient uptake ...L55.56 and67,68,,repetition of same claim. L76 the site from where soil was collected... → I corrected these parts following your advice. L122...Into two parts and each part was 9....Square measures. → I corrected these parts following advices you and the other reviewers as "The experimental site was divided into two, each part was a 9.0 m2 (3.0 m × 3.0 m) area".  L140 In growth chamber under control conditions???? Temperature,humidity,atmospheric pressure,light intervals???? → I corrected to write the detail in materials and methods.  L142 Table 1.....In this experiment.delete full sentence L155.showed L167 showed Table 1,Chemical properties of the sodic and artificial soil.L167-170 IF POSSIBLE PLS Add how much highest and how much lowest value from control. L198.The chemical properties of experimental soil has been presented in table 2.L205 fertile soil... L207.The shoot dry weight of L. chinensis was significantly 208 higher than that of P. chinampoensis( Fig 4).L262 good germination ability.L264 to its survival.Further investigation could help to reach the conclusion..L279. → I corrected these parts following your advice.  Add recent reference to support the claim.L305 add reference to support the results. → I added the reference 32, 33 to support claim and result following your</p>
--	---	---



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

		<p>advice.</p> <p>L333,it is shown ???Table or Fig????L372 Data indicated L338 Na tolerant.... → I corrected these parts following your advice.</p>
<b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments		
<b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments	<p>The paper presents good and informative study about macro nutrient uptake of forage plants in sodic and alkaline soils. English grammar mistakes and space between words should be carefully rechecked by the authors throughout the paper. Some sentences are very long and difficult to understand, should be replaced by short sentences. In the discussion section the data should be analyzed according to previous studies ,may be on different plants in support of presented results. Addition of latest and recent citation from the years 2013/2014 will be advantageous to increase the credibility of paper.</p>	<p>Thank you for your kind comments to my manuscript. I corrected the space issue and manuscript English following advices of you, the other reviewers, and native English speaker. I also collected some long sentences to read easily. Therefore, our manuscript English and sentences were revised thanks to many instructions. I also added new references (31,32, 33 and 37) to increase the credibility of paper.</p>