



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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	The authors are correct in the text the scientific name <i>Lactuca sativa</i> L. In Abstract: Methodology: The authors should present experimental design which was used in the study. Describe in detail all the treatments. Describe the method of statistical analysis of the data. Results: Cite the main results obtained by the use of humic substances on the growth of lettuce. Conclusions: Rewrite the conclusions. The conclusions should answer the hypotheses and objectives of the study. 1. INTRODUCTION The arguments made by the authors are difficult to understand. Authors should rewrite the text. Once the entry must formulate hypotheses and objectives of the work. 2. MATERIALS AND METHODS The description of the methodology is incomprehensible. Authors should improve the writing of the text. Describe in detail the treatments. The experimental design used.	-Ok. -Fixed. -There was one by Cimrin and Mesut 2005, but the yield increase (not nutrients uptake) was insignificant. Also, in our study, the harvest was made early (2 months). The results would not be comparable. -Fixed. -Fixed. Hypotheses were that optimum conditions of growing would result in humic substances at low concentrations to significantly enhance growth of plants. Objectives were to prove that statement using liquid (extracted) humic product -Fixed. Humic rates were determined from 0 to a very high number to ensure that



SDI Review Form 1.6

	I believe that increasing rates of humic substances were evaluated. In this case you must set the data in the regression equations. 3. RESULTS& DISCUSSION The text in the discussion of the data is incomprehensible. Authors should rewrite obeying the rules of scientific writing. Tables and figures are also incomprehensible. Authors should consult a statistician before analyzing the data. Make adjustments regression data. 4. CONCLUSIONS Rewrite the conclusions. The conclusions should answer the hypotheses and objectives of the study.	optimum conditions were achieved. -Fixed. Statistical analyses were completed on basic parameters as well as ANOVA and Fischer LSD. -Fixed.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		