



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Agriculture and Ecology Research International
Manuscript Number:	2014_JAERI_15710
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluations Pellets Bentonite Sulfur Application on Fe and Zn Bioavailability of Saline and Sodic Soil
Type of the 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	It is a good research, but I think we should correct the following points: 1. In the introduction it should be noted that organic matter has not only positive effects but may have negative effects because its alkaline hydrolysis can increase the alkalinity of the medium and the sodium salts can also induce colloidal dispersion. 2. The methodology is very important that the authors indicate the dose of sulfur and gypsum applied in the respective treatments. 3. In the methodology specify the type of organic matter used. 4. In the discussion, the authors must explain the effect of calcium ion displacement sodium exchange complex, based on the Law of Gapon, thereby to strengthen the deductions from their work. 4. In the sake of discussion. Remember that all types of organic matter tends to induce processes of accumulation of salts, so this effect must be considered before the experiment.	1. All previous researches shown that organic matter has positive effects on all soil properties. If respected reviewer has references about negative effects of organic matter, we would like to ask him/her to kindly mention them 2. It was corrected. 3. It was corrected. 4. It was corrected on the same page. 4. The authors are agreed with the opinion of reviewer. However we want to suggest the results of the study to farmers as a guide method for farm management. Therefore the preference of authors is keeping the method



SDI Review Form 1.6

	5. Correct conclusion. Report only that sulfur was highly efficient in the physical-chemical saline and sodic soils improvement. Please clarify the ethical issues if any	It was corrected on the same page.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		