



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 <i>(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)</i>
<u>Compulsory</u> 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.	
<u>Minor</u> 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.). 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?)	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	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.	

Note: Anonymous Reviewer