



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	2013_IJPSS_8206
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of bulk and nano cobalt on barley seedlings and remediation of CoCl ₂ toxicity using NaOCl
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	This manuscript was to investigate the effect of cobalt oxid (pure and nano) on plant and the relationship of cobaltous chloride hexahydate and NaOCl on plant growth. The experimental design was basically reasonable. Results of this experiment are reliable for further investigation of remediation process.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	- The abstract section should pronounce the advantage of this research - The introduction section should describe about the relationship of NaOCl on Co uptake in plant and the toxicity of NaOCl in the nature. - The material and methods section should add cobaltous chloride hexahydate and NaOCl concentration. It was good to briefly describe the experiment of cobaltous chloride hexahydate and NaOCl - Why cobaltous chloride hexahydate was chosen for this research?. - What is the relationship between Co (pure and nano)'s experiment and cobaltous chloride hexahydate and NaOCl 's experiment? - What form of cobalt was used in the research?	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	L 84 showed cobalt (II, III) oxide nanopowder but it did not show in the material and methods. - L 91-95 was long, poorly organized and repetitive. - L100-104, the sentences were rather repetitive, could be more concise. - L 111 should (Table..) be Table. - L 136 should , be . - L 183, noth? - The author should declare the data presentation either the tables or figures. Which one (tables or figures) is suitable for the research? - The scientific name should be italic characters.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	- The author should show the different between this paper and with the other paper in discuss section. - The abstract, discussion and reference section should be adjusted as IJPSS's recommendation.	

Note: Anonymous Reviewer