



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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	1. No Abstract included 2. All references with et al., should be italicized, i.e., Podella <i>et al.</i>, Jordan <i>et al.</i>, throughout the text 3. Page 4, Line one (1) should read 'The experiment ran from August 9th and was harvest on the 10th September 2013. 4. Minimize the use of 'the' even where it is not relevant, e.g., on page 4, paragraph 1, second sentence and paragraph 2, first sentence. Paragraph 2 first sentence could start as 'Soil of the test site' 5. The test crop; alfalfa, had been grown on the study site for the past eight years 6. pH 8.4 is clearly alkaline and not slightly alkaline; see paragraph 2 7. Report should be written with 'past tenses'. This cuts across the entire write-up 8. Page 6, irrigation time must be precise. When was it stopped? 9. Procedures adopted for gravimetric moisture, bulk density and volumetric moisture content were not indicated. 10. Page 7, lines 1-3; to read 'from each test and control plots were randomly selected, ground, analysed for crude protein(Source for analytical procedures??) and measure' ... 11. Page 11; Discussion and Conclusion must be separate entities of this paper. Present Conclusion as a separate section.	1. Abstract was submitted with paper but has been added to the paper itself. 2. All references with et al. have been changed to an italic format. 3. Precise dates added and sentence structure changed. 4. "The" removed from a majority of the sentences. 5. Semi colon must follow a full sentence. Unsure as to what changes need to be made where. 6. Slightly alkaline was quoted form the soil survey. Change was made to read alkaline. 7. Extensive review on tense has prompted a multitude of changes. 8. Change made to incorporate exact dates. 9. Procedure for gravimetric measurements has been added. 10. 3rd party lab testing provided test procedure. 11. Conclusions are made throughout discussion. Consultations with many third parties agree with concept of combing conclusion and discussions section. 12. Some changes made to add depth. 13. Change sentence and removed section 14. See 11



SDI Review Form 1.6

	12. Discussion was very shallow 13. Paragraph 4, line 3; This corresponded with literature.... This sentence is not clear. 14. Page 13. There is no Conclusion on this article	15.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		