



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEA_22580
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of Integrated Nutrient Management for Mandarin Orange Production in Hot Humid Region of Bangladesh
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	This paper refers to an experiment on the use of organic and mineral fertilisers. I do think there are some interesting results here, however due to poor presentation it is difficult to fully assess the scientific quality of the work. I do not fully understand what the treatments were. They only give percentages of recommended dose, but they don't say what this was based on, and what the dose of important nutrients (in particular, N but also P and K). Present all treatments in a table, specifying amount of macronutrients at least. The English in the manuscript is poor, the authors need to get assistance to improve the language.	We have provided the details of treatments in our revised manuscript. We have also checked the manuscript for language and grammatical errors.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	I also think results should be presented as graphs rather than tables. The abstract contains too many details. Statistics should be referred to in a proper way, without the use of value loaded words, e.g. "significantly superior"	As there are so many parameters and thus the number of the graph will be so many. Therefore, we kept the tables. However, some of the data have been presented as Figures in the revised manuscript. We have revised the abstract.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		