



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2014_AJEA_13561
Title of the Manuscript:	The Use of a Protein Enhanced Surfactant to Increase Yield of Alfalfa
Type of the Article	Short 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	- o Make more attention for the English. - o Revise all the references cited within the manuscript. Make sure that all references are cited with the same style.	Have had extensive corrections made for the English. All citations have been corrected to the proper format.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1. Introduction: Introduction is too long. It should be shortened. 2. Materials and Methods: - o Insert the equation used to calculate the irrigation efficiency of the irrigation system; - o Insert the equation used to calculate the gravimetric water content of soil cores; - o The equation used to calculate WUE should be included in the Material and Methods part; 3. Results and discussion: - o The data used in this study are well controlled and robust in order to prove the effect of the surfactant to increase the yield of alfalfa; - o However authors do not provide relevant and current references during the discussion of results; - o During the discussion, make good use of the results presented in tables and figures; - o The statistical analysis performed in this study is good, but the results should be more interpreted and discussed. 4. Conclusions: - o Most of the conclusions are not supported by data presented inside the manuscript;	Corrections have been made to meet a majority of the minor revision comments. Thank you for the review.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	- o Conclusions must be shortened to indicate the most relevant data and its explanation. 5. References: - O All the references are not adequate. Please write all the references with the same style as described in: http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=general-guideline-for-authors	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		