

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Soil Science and Plant Nutrition
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJSSPN_110978
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparative Assessment of Soil and Selected Crop in Cement Dust Contaminated Environment in Okpella Area of Edo North, Nigeria
Type of the Article	Research Paper

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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>Mention name of crop in the title</p> <p>Needs full revision and holistic explanation.</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>Results need more explanation along with elaborative discussion with interlinkage of parameters.</p> <p>Not sufficient in discussion and also, not recent.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Needs improvement.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>1- Introduction emphasises the greenhouse gases emission and its consequences, but the study didn't include GHGs. Part can be removed.</p> <p>2- The OC content in AS2 is higher and N content is lower, vice versa for OS1. Elaborate discussion on lower N content, though the OC is higher.</p> <p>3- Elaborate discussion on EC.</p> <p>4- The results and discussions are written very casually. Please revisit it and elaborate judiciously.</p> <p>5- English is poorly written. Many times it is not understandable what he/she wants to convey.</p> <p>6- Conclusion need to be clearer. The FTIR and XRD doesn't found mention in the conclusion.</p> <p>7- Needs major revision in writing and explaining the results.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Alok Singh Jayara
Department, University & Country	G B Pant University of Agriculture & Technology, India