



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

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

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
In the introduction additional few lines will greatly improve quality of the section. This is on whether there is any earlier work in application of P in or around this area. Mention any deficiency in the existing recommendation(s), the author addresses. If no earlier work then there can more narrative on comparable situation elsewhere. This was mentioned in the earlier comments; it is pleasing to note it was addressed, but not fully. In materials and methods, indicate your source of P and the percentage of P in the source. Indicate why P was not placed in planting holes at the planting time, either in the Introduction or Materials and Methods – section. Usually P is applied at planting time. In line 86 Hill and not Stand Dry matter sampling not explained Soil nutrient analysis, Table 4, the control plots had higher quantities of OC and P contrary to expectation, need to provide a scientific	There was an amendment and addition in line 47-48, 55-57, 60-62. Deficiency and existing recommendation were provided. Single super phosphate (18% phosphorus) was applied. P can be applied at planting, 3-4 weeks after planting even for top dressing few weeks before flowering according to existing literature. Dry matter determination and sampling was explained Table 1 and 4 were merged. Residual OC of soil was higher at control is a find of the experiment.



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

explanation for the reason during the, discussion or conclusion. Graphical presentation of the data, before planting and during the second trial maybe would help. In Discussion Line 153, sentence starting as “The soil cultivated. . .” is not clear In the modelling of the data, the author needs to use more words in expressing the model in the context of the data. The author could have used longitudinal modelling and this would have extracted more information from the data. Otherwise the data do not appear to be correctly fitted into the model used.	It has been re rewritten. This also has been addressed.
I thank the author for reacting to the earlier comments. One can read and see great improvement. There is, however, more to be done to make the manuscript even better and clearer. This is the way I see it.	Thanks