Journal Name:	Asian Soil Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_ASRJ_44853**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Soil Fertility as influenced by incorporation of K enriched azolla**
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	**Abstract becomes boring to read after 250 words……..you must reduce to 300 max. Also I expected you to conclude abstract on significant finding on azolla since its unique.** **The recent APA style of et al has no ., and no longer in italics……** **Divide your Mat & Met into 2 subsections for easier readability. From line 78 should bear a subsection title** **References are quite old……plz update some of them** **3 tables at same time appears boring to reader……plot one into bar chat etc** **References must be overhauled……..follow a particular style for all refs** **Divide your work into sections and subsections**	Reduced to 350 words. Further, reduction of abstraction may not explain the nature, purpose, experiment details and practical implications of results.
Minor REVISION comments	Line 36: incomplete.....chemical fertilizer in farming/cropping etc? Line 44: replace with "developed"/"explored"/"exploited" etc Line 37-39: please add a literature background before the generalization Line 48: is something missing? Line 78: write full Line 84: "was" extracted Line 94 & others: I suggest you discuss 60% differently and 100% differently and then compare then afterwards to make it interesting Ilne 101: change to parity, equivalenece, similarity etc Linw 101/102/104/114 etc: change all ppm to mg/L or mg/kg as case may be line 121: Plz recast Line 157: how? was their an increase or decrease? line 185: remove @ line 216: change to improved line 220: furthermore Line 74: add a reference before the next sentence line 105: re-caption line 118/155: re-caption line 231/233: not consistent line 259/268 etc: different font?	Corrected It is a chemical reagent commonly used in analysis and mentioned as chromic acid The impact of soil moisture on nutrient availability can be known clearly when it is discussed together. Can be changed Sentence can be changed for getting right meaning The available K content decreased when moisture is increased in soil. The symbol @ represent at the rate of The previous word is resulted. Therefore, improved word after resulted may not hold good. May be changed as Available Nitrogen, Available Phosphorus and Available Potassium instead of Available N, Available P and Available K. Can be changed
Optional/General comments	**shorten the topic to "soil Fertility as influenced by K enriched azolla"** since you researched on alternative fertilizer: I think there should be a recommendation where are your keywords? Adding a picture of azolla will be smart	Changing of topic may not reflect the two different entities of growing of azolla in K enriched water and then incorporation of K enriched azolla to soil maintained at 2 different moisture condition. Included. Added experimental picture.

PART 2:

	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)*
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	Suggested corrections are made.

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.
Kindly see the following link:
http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20