



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2014_AJEA_13859
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of nitrogen fertilizer rates on Panicle length and Yield component of some improved rice varieties (Oryza 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

As corrected in red	Reviewer's comment The author may take as corrected or correct appropriately	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 Introduction Material and method Results References	Comments on main paper U1 and U3 U4 The pH soil to water ratio must indicate whether in KCl or CaCl₂ or H₂O. The electrical conductivity should indicate whether saturated paste or soil to water ratio. The IITA manual specify the ratios This should conform to the journal's style	Most of the comments were constructive and have been improved on and highlighted
Minor REVISION comments All deleted or corrected in red	The author may correct otherwise	The comments have been corrected
Optional/General comments	The results, materials and Methods have the same words in a paper i have reviewed already for the following journal: '2014_IJPSS_13637. Evaluation of different improved upland rice varieties for low soil nitrogen adaptability' Makes me feel is the same with just a change in the title.	The results, materials and methodology may appear the same since this manuscript and the one the reviewer is referring to are extracted from the same experiment but different parameters and being addressed in the different manuscripts.