

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Soil Science and Plant Nutrition
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJSSPN_122217
Title of the Manuscript:	Efficiency of the combination of vermicompost and zero valent iron for the remediation of lead, copper and aluminum
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1-reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1-reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1-reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>In general, the study is important if it is studied and applied with precision and scientific standards. This work lacked all of that, as it didn't present any of it, whether in preparing the materials or in applying them in the treatment process. Also, the title has no relation to the content, as it didn't mention the type of soil that it would treat.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>No. This work is an evaluation study to evaluate different remediation materials in ecosystems and application of these materials in remediation of polluted soil ecosystems. It is preferred that authors change the title to be suitable to this meaning</p>	
<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>	<p>The authors concentrated on 3 pollutants. What about other pollutants status in the soil? He also didn't mention any results specific to the plant.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>No</p>	
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>Unfortunately, this manuscript is very very weak scientifically and did not address the subject in a scientific manner, as the author didn't include the methods of preparing the materials, as well as the most important morphological and descriptive characteristics of the materials used, as well as other results.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>References must be renewed with recent references, needs more references.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Language of the manuscript must be modified</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Needs clarification of methods of preparation of materials - Needs to display the results of the characterization of the prepared materials - What are the sizes of prepared zero valent iron? - Has zero valent iron been incubated with soil - It is expected that there will be negative effects on the plant when using zero valent iron at a high concentration. Did it appear with you? Where? - Where are the treatment codes? 	

Review Form 3

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:	Mohammed Awad Mousa Mousa
Department, University & Country	King Saud University, Saudi Arabia