



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2014_AJEA_13243
Title of the Manuscript:	Low concentrations of humic substances enhanced the growth of Lactuca sativa L.
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	- Some words are not clear such as atlowproduct, ratesbetween, beendocumented - One plant never represent as a replicate. Maybe authors can use each four plants as one replicate. - Phosphorus concentration in the control solution is very high, what is the reference of this solution. Is it the recommended solution for lettuce? - What is the final electrical conductivity (EC) of the each nutrient solution? I think the proper EC for cultivated should be into consideration when design such experiments. If EC is different between the treatments, then, there were another factor affected the results. - The title of tables should be more clear, - The weight of the produced lettuce is very low. - What is the statistical design of this experiment? - The concentration of Product HA is change from part to another, it is not clear,	-This was caused by error when the word document was uploaded. -Each replicate consisted of 12 plants. -We used a typical commercial product for horticulture including lettuce. Also, its rate was kept low to evaluate the effect of humic substances better. - EC values were added to Table 1. Final EC of solutions were not measured, however as shown in Table 4, the increase in NPK (should be parallel to the increase of EC) was taken into considerations. -Fixed. -Harvest was made only after 2 months. -The experiments were designed so that optimum conditions could be achieved, i.e. from 0 (control) to a very high rate (580 mg/L) humic substances. The results were analyzed for basic parameters as well as ANOVA and Fischer LSD. -To avoid confusion, the rates were shown both as "Product HA" and as "humic substances". Product HA contained 1.38% humic substances. Product HA of 42,000



SDI Review Form 1.6

		mg/L was equivalent to humic substances of 580 mg/L.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	- Change root pores to root hairs. - Change root pores to number of leaves.	-Fixed.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	There are several typing errors that should be taken into account in order to improve the manuscript.	-Fixed.