



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 (<i>Oryza sativa</i> 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

	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- This study is general report I don't see any scientific description. 2- The introduction there include contradictions, no harmonizes for the previous literature. Fertilizer can't apply at ripening stage (P2L42) is not possible. It is not possible? 3- Applng recommend dose from N fertilizer will not decline grain quality. Only maybe applying high rate of N (More than 200 kg N ha⁻¹) can affect the grain quality. 4- Why the author focus only on the relation of panicle length with fertilizer rate? There is nothing new to say off course the panicle length significantly affected by fertilizer. Materials and Method 5- The material is very long and is not clear. Also you can't calculate the yield (kg ha⁻¹) from this formula. The error will be very high but may be for yield component estimation yield (g/plant or kg/m²) is more logic. 6- The data in table 1 (Fe) is very high I think this number is not correct. 7- There are other yield component traits like, panicle/m², panicle weight and 1000 grain weight is more important and also significantly affected with fertilizer application. 8- I think it will be better if the author add two level of fertilizer 160 N and 200 N. Results	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	9- What the difference between results presented in Fig 2 and Fig 4? Both of the figures present grain yield (kg ha^{-1}) but there is a big difference between the two values? Discussion 10- The author says the longer panicles obtained in treatments receiving higher nitrogen during panicle growth period. How know that and you don't do any analysis for rice plant and there no estimation for N use efficiency. 11- We can't say MWUR varieties adaptable to low nitrogen more than NERICA varieties because 80 kg ha^{-1} N also is low fertilizer.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	1- I think the data of this investigation (only for one year and one location) is not sufficient for publication. Author need at least to repeat this trial for two seasons or two locations. Author need to estimate the N use efficiency and study more physiological traits related to drought in both MWUR and NERICA varieties.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Anonymous
Department, University & Country	Senegal