



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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	Abstract should have a statement on conclusions from the study Add a section on conclusions at end of the document Need to indicate when the samples were taken from the fields, at what age the height, stem girth were recorded (line 89-92)	25 – 75 kg ha ⁻¹ improved the yield of pigeon pea Concluding section have been included 2, 6, 10 weeks after fertilizer application
Minor REVISION comments	The word "performance" should be replaced with a variable that was measured, or else deleted from the title. Also, the word "degraded" is redundant. Add reference to sentence in line 44-46 These statements (line 51-59) may be deleted since it does not flow well with that before or after. Introduction should highlight the relationship between P and N availability and uptake. Need to add soil type at line 75 Sentence on line 105-106 is hanging	Title has been reframed Reference added Deleted Done Reframed removed
Optional/General comments	The manuscript lacks the scientific basis for the study. The Author(s) need(s) to revise the background to highlight Why they compare these soil properties such as minerals, and even found that they increase (line 108-116? Do they expect them to increase? Then you should compare them in the plant rather than in the soil.	Corrected. The soil testing was carried out before the residual experiment hence it needed interpretation and discussion.