ReviewForm3

JournalName:	**AsianJournalofSoilScienceand PlantNutrition**
ManuscriptNumber:	**Ms_AJSSPN_126023**
TitleoftheManuscript:	**EffectofSalinityonInorganicPhosphorusFixationinSaraandBajoaSoilSeriesofGangesTidalFloodplains**
Typeofthe Article	

ReviewForm3

PART1:ReviewComments

Compulsory REVISIONcomments	**Reviewer'scomment**	**Author'sFeedback***(Pleasecorrectthemanuscriptandhighlightthatpart inthe manuscript.Itismandatorythatauthorsshould writehis/herfeedbackhere)*
Please write a few sentences regarding the importanceof this manuscript for the scientific community. Why doyou like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4sentencesmaybe requiredfor thispart.	This manuscript seeks to determine the influence of salinity on soil phosphorus availability to plants in two setsof soils in the Ganges floodplain. The manuscript may have important local and regional interest if the results areused to provide new knowledge to farmers on putative ways to fertilize more efficiently their lands under salinity(something missing in the discussion and conclusions). Furthermore, at a general level, the manuscript may be ofinterest to the scientific community working on saline soils around the world. However, I believe that theconclusions of this manuscript are not sufficiently worked out to have a real impact on the scientific community.Themanuscriptwouldgreatlybenefitfrom rewritingthediscussion and conclusions,seeking to gofurther and notjustexplaining the resultsobtained.	
Isthetitleofthearticlesuitable? (Ifnotpleasesuggestanalternativetitle)	Yes,itcanbesuitable.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do yousuggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in thissection?Please writeyour suggestionshere.	The abstract is understandable, but it lacks the inclusion of the initial hypotheses and the discussion of theresults, as well as adding some conclusions. As for the methodology, a more exhaustive explanation of thematerialsandmethodsusedwouldalso beuseful.	
Aresubsectionsandstructureofthemanuscriptappropriate?	Yes,boththesubsectionsandthemanuscriptareappropriate.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientificcorrectness of this manuscript. Why do you think thatthis manuscript is scientifically robust and technicallysound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be requiredforthispart.	From my point of view, this paper needs a lot of work before it can be published. Overall, it would be greatlyimproved by improving the discussion of the results and the conclusions. Below I add some comments for theauthors. 1. The introduction has some paragraphs with very similar information that could be regrouped and rewritten toshorten the introduction and perhaps, add other information relevant to the manuscript. The "repeated" parts dealwith the importance of P for plants. On the other hand, I believe that information on the current use of the soilsstudied in this paper could be included. Are they cultivated? Which crops are used? What kind of owners usethose lands? Why were those soils chosen for this work? Answering these questions, could considerably enrichand improve theintroductionandthe manuscriptasa whole. 2. The introduction lacks the starting hypotheses which are crucial for a scientific document. Please, try to includeyourhypothesis. 3. The introduction mentions that P fractionation method is used for saline and cultivable soils, but this is notcompletely true. P fractionation is a very common methodology used for any type of soil in any environment.Currently there are quite a few works using this methodology in forest soils, for example, since P is also alimiting nutrient for trees, affecting the fertility of forest soils and thus, the productivity of plantations. In myopinion,makingabroaderintroductionofthemethodologyused,wouldhelptounderstanditsimportanceandits intenseusein thescientific community.Thiswouldhaveanimpacton therobustnessofthemanuscript. 4. Thecitation andreferenceofWalkely&Black 1934ismissing.Although asubsequently transformedmethodology isused, theoriginal methodology from whichitisbased should be cited. 5. Inthefollowingparagraph,attheendofthesectioninM&M:"SomePhysicalandChemicalAnalysisofSoils", punctuationmarksaremissingand/orneedtobe corrected. "The total phosphorus content in the soil was analyzed using the vanadomolybdate yellow color method, on theother hand, the total nitrogen of the sample was measured using the micro Kjeldahl method, as outlined byJackson (1973), The complexometric titration method was used to determine water soluble plus exchangeablecalcium and magnesium (Schwartzenbach et al., 1946) Water soluble plus exchangeable sodium (Na) content oftherootandshootsamplewasalsomeasuredbytheFlameemissionspectroscopic(FES)method."Further	

	more, the last sentence talks about root and shoot samples, but nowhere else in the manuscript is thereanythingthatreferstothosesamples.Should thatsentencebedeleted?Istheremissinginformation aboutthose samples?Pleasecorrectthis.	

	6. A table of the results of the physical-chemical analyses carried out on both types of soil would help a lot tounderstand the results and to follow the article well. A table indicating pH, EC, texture, original salinity of thesoils,soilclassification, etc. 7. It is essential to know the initial salinity of the soils studied, especially if they are cultivated, in order tounderstand how salinity can affect nutrients and therefore crops. If the soils studied already have a high salinityandtherearecropswithgoodproduction,whatproblemwould therebewiththesoilP?Thatiswhy Ithink itisessentialtocompletethe information onthe soilsandon thecropsalongthe manuscript. 8. Inthefirstsentenceofthe"Incubation Experiment"section,Ithinkitisnotnecessarytoindicatethelaboratory where theexperimentwascarriedout. 9. TheFiguresaredifficulttounderstoodduetomistakes.Sometimesthenamesoftheaxesaremissing andthereareextra wordsthat makeunderstandingdifficult("cientos"). Please,review it. 10. Inthefirstparagraphofthe"ResultsandDiscussion"section,youshouldincludesomereferences,please. 11. The last sentence ("The values of different discrete forms of inorganic P at various time intervals arepresentedinFig1.")in thefirstparagraphofthe"InorganicPhosphorusFractionsinSoil"section,indicatesthatFigure 1 shows the values of the different forms of inorganic P at different time intervals. However, Figure 1shows "Changes in Fe Al-P content in Bajoa series under different salinity treatments". Please, correct thisinconsistency. 12. When explaining the results for RS-P content, it is said that with a salinity of 2 dS/m the P content increasesintheBajoaseries (thesameoccursin theSaraseriesfor2 and 4dS/m).Itwould beveryusefulto try to explainthisvariationinthediscussionof theresults. 13. The conclusions are poor. The article needs to improve the discussion in order to have more powerfulconclusions.Inaddition,soilpHvaluesaregivenintheconclusionsforthefirsttime.Iconsiderthatthese valuesshould not appear in the conclusions, but rather previously in the results of the manuscript (together with the restoftheinformation from thephysicochemicalanalyses), in order to beabletodiscussmuchbetter alltheother resultsobtained.	
Arethereferencessufficientandrecent? Ifyouhavesuggestions of additional references, please mentiontheminthe review form. - MinorREVISIONcomments	They areok.Perhapssome newestreferencescouldbe included.	
Isthelanguage/Englishqualityofthearticlesuitableforscholarlycommunications?	Yes,Englishquality issuitable.	
Optional/Generalcomments		

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)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Ruth C. Martín-Sanz**
Department, University & Country	**University Institute of Research in Sustainable Forest Management, Higher Technical School of Agricultural Engineering of Palencia, University of Valladolid, Spain**