

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Journal of Soil Science and Plant Nutrition</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJSSPN_97159</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Phytoremediation of Copper and arsenic contaminated soil using Gladiolus (<i>Gladiolus grandifloras</i>) and chrysanthemum (<i>Chrysanthemum morifolium</i>) Plants</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### **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:

<https://www.journalajssp.com/index.php/AJSSPN/editorial-policy> )

**Review Form 1.7**

**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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p>	<p>The article might represent an interesting base for further studies on using gladiolus (<i>Gladiolus grandifloras</i>) and chrysanthemum (<i>Chrysanthemum morifolium</i>) plants for phytoremediation of copper and arsenic polluted soils.</p> <p>The title is not suitable, since phytoremediation would involve also evaluation of plant effect on the concentration of pollutants from the soil samples. It would be more appropriated: Preliminary studies on... / or: Studies on potential use of gladiolus....for phytoremediation of soil contaminated with....</p> <p>There are some data missing from the abstract. Please find the comments below (at Results and discussions). Yes.</p> <p>The manuscript has some serious problems. Please, take in consideration the following:</p> <p><b>MATERIALS AND METHODS</b></p> <p><b>Study Site</b> The size of each pot was made large to facilitate the root system of the plants.... What size? The design of the pots was so good that ease ... Meaning?</p> <p><b>Copper and arsenic Contaminants</b> Copper and arsenic were mixed with prepared soil, air dried, and sieved on sieve #4 mesh size to ensure an equal mixing of the contaminant in the soil matrix table 1.</p> <p>How did the authors establish these concentrations? (previous studies, references).</p> <p><b>Up-keeping of plants</b> Trace elements were sprayed (solutions; concentrations)</p> <p><b>Measuring contaminant concentration</b> Measurements were made of extraction and pollutant concentrations in the soil as well as the various plant sections employed (Methods used; references).</p> <p><b>Extraction of heavy metals from plant parts</b> Even though the authors mention a reference (Narwal et al. 1999), they should mention in the paper: After extraction, the plant parts were subjected to the centrifuge tube with reagents of various concentrations (what concentrations?)</p> <p>The adsorbed Cu and As were extracted using ammonium acetate solutions (what concentrations?) The adsorbed Cu and As were extracted using ammonium acetate solutions (what concentration?) of various pH levels (what pH values?)</p> <p><b>RESULTS AND DISCUSSION</b> The extracted solution of Cu and As was measured in ppm from roots, stems, leaves and flowers. The various quantity of copper and arsenic were observed from plant parts of Gladiolus and chrysanthemum as shown in the graph below. The results presented correspond to what concentrations of reagents? what concentration and pH of ammonium acetate solution? What were the results when other concentrations or pH values were used? A possible explanation for the</p>	
<p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b> <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>results.</p> <p>Yes</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>Needs improving.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Csutak Ortansa</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Bucharest, Romania</b>