



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2013_AJEA_7200
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECTS OF DIFFERENT APPLICATION RATES OF SINGLE SUPER PHOSPHATE ON THE PERFORMANCE, NUTRIENT UPTAKE AND NODULATION OF PIGEON PEA IN DEGRADED ULTISOL
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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	In the <u>introduction</u> the author has solely given general information as is in literature. It would have been complete and technically sound if some more justifying and supporting current research reporting was included. Under the sub title Soil Analysis-line 101, at some point the author implies that the experiment was in the lab and soil collected from the field. Let it come out clearly that plots were in the field and this is where the planting and sampling was done. Include some details on sampling The author needs to have the following: "Results and Discussion" and "Conclusion". This means that from line 100 to line 191, may have to be re-written again with the changed structure. The author has not indicated how the fertilizer treatments were applied. Word, planting holes and the plots are supposed to be featuring quite often when explaining this. There is poor discussion of the results	Some justifications has been made as seen in the manuscript Corrected Corrected Corrected rewritten
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Under the Introduction, Line 43, the sentence," The growth habit. . . "need to be revised to correct the grammar and make the point being put across clear. In materials and methods Line 75: Sampling depth of 1-15 cm was too shallow. The plant spacing of pigeon peas is not given. More details would be required on sampling of the nodules. The author needs to consult the biometrician on the use multiple range test. Duncan's is no longer being recommended. Tables of the results can be inserted in the text Line 128: It is not 75 kg ha Enwenzor, et al., 1987. In the reference list the year is given as 1989 –which is which	corrected Duncan's multiple range test is not outdated. Corrected 1989
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	After reacting to the comments and reorganizing the sub-titles the manuscript can be resubmitted for a review	Ok