

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics &amp; Sociology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_88895
Title of the Manuscript:	A review on potential of field crops in Phytoremediation.
Type of the Article	Review A rticle

### 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.journalarrb.com/index.php/ARRB/editorial-policy> )

### **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)
<b><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Title: The title is informative</li><li>Abstract: The abstract is adequately addressed</li><li>Introduction: The introduction is concise, and clear)</li><li>Materials and Methods: The Methods section is currently addressed.</li><li>Results: The results are clearly presented.</li><li>Discussion: The discussion is well written and adequately addressed.</li><li>The manuscript is well written. The purpose, methods and results are clearly presented.</li><li>Conclusions: The conclusion is very conclusive, since based on a small sample size. (Appropriate and adequate references to related works covered sufficiently in the list).</li></ul>	Thanks for such a wonderful comments. I tried hard to do justice with this article.
<b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Tables: The titles of the figures should be more informative. They are vital and quite well.</li><li>Tables are significant and well-presented.</li></ul>	Thanks
<b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>This is well and acceptable, and it contributes to the Annual Research &amp; Review in Biology in a valuable way.</li></ul>	Thanks alot

### **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)	no