



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	2014_IJPSS_15063
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of age at harvest and leaf position on the yield and nutritional composition of <i>Celosia argentea</i> 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 <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>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	See the indications on the lines added below in the table. Please attend the posts comments	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Along the manuscript there are several together words, Please put all of them separated. It is mandatory.	THANKS. THE WORDS WERE NOT MERGED WHEN I PREPARED THE MANUSCRIPT. I WAS UNABLE TO ATTACH THE MANUSCRIPT FILE WHEN IT WAS SAVED AS 2013 MICROSOFT WORD VERSION WHICH I USED ORIGINALLY SO I HAD TO CONVERT IT TO A PREVIOUS VERSION OF MICROSOFT WORD WHEN I WAS TO ATTACH THE MANUSCRIPT FILE (97-2003). THAT MAY BE THE REASON FOR THE MERGED WORDS. I CHECKED THE ORIGINAL MANUSCRIPT I SENT IN MY MAIL BOX BUT THE WORDS WERE NOT MERGED. HOWEVER, I VE NOTED AND CORRECTED SUCH IN THE MANUSCRIPT SENT TO ME. OTHER CORRECTIONS HAVE BEEN NOTED AND CORRECTED ACCORDINGLY.



SDI Review Form 1.6

Materials and Methods	What is the model of the spectrophotometer? Page 2, Line 61. Include the required data.	
Result and Discussion	What statistical analysis were carried out? Page 2 Lines 73 y 74. Include the statistical analysis carried out.	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE WAS DONE USING SAS PACKAGE AND FISHER'S LSD WAS USED FOR THE MEAN SEPERATION. THIS WAS STATED IN THE MATERIALS AND METHODS. PAGE 2, LINE 66-68. SO WE FEEL IT SHOULD NOT BE REPEATED IN LINES 73& 74. OTHER CORRECTIONS HAVE BEEN FIXED. THKS.
Result and Discussion	Table 1. Title at the top of the columns are absent. Standard error of the means It is missing a foot legend of table with the significant differences between the ages Page 3, Table 1. 1) Include the titles in the columns. 2) Include the standard errors of the means 3) Include a foot legend with significant values (probability) between groups	
	Table 2 The format makes unclear the table Pages 4 y 5. Fix the table 2 format	
Conclusion	There is no conclusion regarding the benefits of consuming plant at different ages Page 6, lines 190-193. Include a conclusion regarding the benefits of consuming plant at different ages	