



SDI Review Form 1.6

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>)

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	<p>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.</p> <p>The recent APA style of et al has no ., and no longer in italics.....</p> <p>Divide your Mat & Met into 2 subsections for easier readability. From line 78 should bear a subsection title</p> <p>References are quite old.....plz update some of them</p> <p>3 tables at same time appears boring to reader.....plot one into bar chat etc</p> <p>References must be overhauled.....follow a particular style for all refs</p> <p>Divide your work into sections and subsections</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Line 36: incomplete.....chemical fertilizer in farming/cropping etc?</p> <p>Line 44: replace with "developed"/"explored"/"exploited" etc</p> <p>Line 37-39: please add a literature background before the generalization</p> <p>Line 48: is something missing?</p> <p>Line 78: write full</p> <p>Line 84: "was" extracted</p> <p>Line 94 & others: I suggest you discuss 60% differently and 100% differently and then compare then afterwards to make it interesting</p> <p>lne 101: change to parity, equivalence, similarity etc</p> <p>Linw 101/102/104/114 etc: change all ppm to mg/L or mg/kg as case may be</p> <p>line 121: Plz recast</p> <p>Line 157: how? was their an increase or decrease?</p> <p>line 185: remove @</p> <p>line 216: change to improved</p> <p>line 220: furthermore</p> <p>Line 74: add a reference before the next sentence</p> <p>line 105: re-caption</p> <p>line 118/155: re-caption</p> <p>line 231/233: not consistent</p> <p>line 259/268 etc: different font?</p>	
Optional/General comments	<p>shorten the topic to "soil Fertility as influenced by K enriched azolla"</p> <p>since you researched on alternative fertilizer: I think there should be a recommendation where are your keywords?</p> <p>Adding a picture of azolla will be smart</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

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>

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Nkwoada, Amarachi Udoka</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Federal University Of Technology Owerri, Nigeria</i>