



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

|                          |                                                                                                                          |
|--------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Journal Name:            | <a href="#">American Journal of Experimental Agriculture</a>                                                             |
| Manuscript Number:       | Ms_AJEA_23411                                                                                                            |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Dry mass of shoot and nodulation of the pigeon pea fertilized with reactive rock phosphate in the Cerrado Oxisol, Brazil |
| Type of the Article      | Original Research Articles                                                                                               |

**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**

|                                     | <b>Reviewer's comment</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 | <b>Author's comment</b> (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)                                                                                                                                                 |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments | <p>Abstract: Grammatical error, Re-rewrite the sentence like this: Among the most used crops, the pigeon pea (<i>Cajanus cajan</i>) promotes biological nitrogen fixation, and crucial phosphorus role in this reaction. Remove submitted analysis and replace it with: subjected to analysis of ..... There was not 430 mg/dm<sup>3</sup> among the treatments, how did you get the 430 mg/dm<sup>3</sup> as an outstanding performance in your result in the abstract section? Lots of grammatical error. Let's the English speaker proofread this manuscript,</p> <p>The Introduction section, lack coherence and grammatical error e.g. Considering the of phosphorus solubilisation..... Remove the of in above sentence.</p> <p><b>MATERIAL AND METHODS. Add s to material.</b> A full detail of experimental methods was not given. How did you apply potassium? Moreover, please, let us see the physico-chemical properties of rock phosphate used in this experiment. You can present the physico-chemical properties inform of Table. The results were submitted to analysis of variance..... Change submitted to subjected. Present the weight unit as mg/g in this experiment. The statistical method used must be re-run. Authors mentioned that they used completely randomised design. Separation of means must be done using Duncan multiple range test or any other means, not with regression analysis. The statistical method used in this experiment is highly questionable. The</p> | <p>All correction suggestions were considered by the authors. Some parts of the text were rewritten as suggested.</p> <p>The modifications in the text are highlighted in yellow</p> <p>The authors consider that the statistical test is correct, treatments are quantitative and the regression analysis applies in this case.</p> |



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

|                                         |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          |  |
|-----------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|
|                                         | authors used seven treatments (0; 100; 200; 300; 400; 500 and 600 mg dm <sup>-3</sup> of P <sub>2</sub> O) replicated four times. There was not 430 mg dm of P <sub>2</sub> O among these treatments. Authors need to re-run statistical analysis using appropriate statistical tools. Wrong analysis leads to wrong and confusing results. See how data was statistical analysed on rock phosphate by Akinrinde et al. 2003 and other related articles. |  |
| <b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments   |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          |  |
| <b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          |  |