



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	All the text requires editing for words together, probably derived from software errors The origin of the humic substances should be better details (coal?) Each experiment was performed on a single pot, with 12 plants on the same medium. How the effective differences were granted? Could the differences achieved in pot 6 be derived from some variation (increased fungal development derived from higher organic load?) Any reference on the literature to support the conclusions for the different effect between pot 5 and 6? Comparison of results with literature on humic substance effect of lettuce is missing or other similar vegetables is missing ex: DOI: 10.1080/ 09064710510008559 K. Mesut Cimrin & Ismail Yilmaz.	-Error occurred when manuscript was uploaded. -It was mentioned in the manuscript “low-energy coal”. -Each unit was randomly selected and received the same treatments except the amounts of humic substances (and nutrients present in Product HA, which was discussed later). We did not evaluate other parameters including fungal growth. Should it happened, it would be attributed due to the presence of humic substances. -We were considering this article but it did not have significant on yields growth, only on nutrients uptake. Also, our harvest was early (2 months), the results would not be comparable.
Minor REVISION comments	Abstract: - Lactucasativa are two words: Lactuca sativa. Correct through the text - Consider substituting rates by concentration in the humic substances solutions Introduction - “Laboratory experiments showed that a dry purified humic product enhanced the growth of	-Fixed. -We both mentioned concentrations in “Product HA” and “humic substances” to avoid any confusion. -Fixed.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	cucumber plants grown in solution <u>with optimum</u> reported rates between 100 to 300 mgkg⁻¹" - References 1, 4, 5 and 6 all refer to ornamental plants and should be presented together sequentially. - Confirm if 31,250 mgkg⁻¹ is correct for the reference on zinnia. - Explain in a new paragraph that experiments to investigate the efficacy of humic substances, in order to achieve significant plant growth at the lowest possible concentration were taken by the Canadian Humalite International Inc. of Edmonton, Alberta, Canada, and described in detail in the present manuscript. Continue with... in these experiments.... Experimental - missing units in "7 deep water culture growing units" - in table 1 product HA was not yet defined. Consider positioning after the text. - in table 1 add <u>Total</u> humic substances - the paragraph with the light and air conditions should be repositioned in the first paragraph, together with temperature and humidity - as only one plant was omitted, remove the sentence "Perished plants were separated and recorded as 0 measurements in the analyses." - Table 2: Plant survival rates <u>and study design</u> - Figure 1 duplicates information on table 3. Choose to present the results solely as table or in a more complete figure, with sd included in the bars - The justification for the efficiency of low concentration of humic substance cannot be	-It was made in order based on years articles being published to show continuity in research in this area. -Confirmed, i.e. 3.125%, it was a dry (non-extracted) product. -Fixed. -These were seven growing unit. -Fixed. -We prefer "humic substances" as defined by HPTA/IHSS. Yes, it was the sum (total) of humic acids and fulvic acids). -We prefer to separate them as temperature and humidity were applied for the whole lab. The growing units and light came later in discussion. -Fixed. -Fixed. -We wanted to emphasize that after optimum rates were achieved, further increased in growth was observed due to the presence of nutrients in Product HA. -It was made in response to other studies in which plants were grown on other media (like
--	--	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

	supported on statement 1 “all plant roots were submerged in the growing solution, therefore all nutrients and humic substances were efficiently absorbed by the plants”. The efficient submersion should be granted on all treatments - The sentence: “This finding was important when comparing different commercial humic products.” Refers to what studies?	soil), in which higher optimum rates were found. -Literatures 1 to 8.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		