

REVIEWER COMMENTS

1. General Comments. The work presented deals with quite exciting issue of phosphorus application rates, which deserves due consideration because of its importance in plant health and improved productivity. However, the manuscript was not well prepared to be considered for publication in [American Journal of Experimental Agriculture](#) at its present form. Thus, it requires thorough editorial work including the technical language. Further, authors did not follow the journal format almost in all aspects and sections. The author (s) has/have a serious flaw while selecting fertilizer plan. This clearly shows the reluctance of the investigators.

2. Specific Comments

Title

Title is too lengthy. Shorten it.

Page 1 Line 2. Effect instead effects.

Page 2 Line 3. what do you mean by performance? Choose proper word.

Abstract

1. This section requires some editorial works.
2. Page 1 Line 10. Critical or essential? Replace nutrients with nutrient.
3. Page 1 Line 11. Write as Two year experiment was conducted
4. Page 1 Line 16. Throughout the text change kg/ha to kg ha⁻¹. Furthermore, is it was SSP at these different rates or it was P application at these rates? If it was based on SSP application then whole experiment is wrong.
5. Page 1 Line 18. Change as soil was low in essential nutrients.
6. Page 1 Line 24. Replace gain yield with grain yield.
7. Page 1 Lines 24-28. Rewrite this section. The concluding lines are even worst, please rewrite.

Introduction

The introduction part involves a lot of punctuation problems and needs thorough language edition.

1. Page 2 Line 39. Replace containing with contain.
2. Page 2 Line 18.
3. Page 2 Line 42. Rewrite as “increases maize yield” only and then keep reference. All the references in the text are not formatted according to journal format.
4. Page 2 Line 45. Add reference.
5. Page 2 Line 18. Replace help with helps
6. Page 2 Lines 50-54. It's totally wrong and bad syntax.
7. Page 2 Line 60. Start as new paragraph.

Materials and methods

There are several junks in this section. Sometimes mixing results with materials and methods is observed.

1. Page 3 Lines 78-79. How did you calculated KCl pH? As you have mentioned it in table 1. Please specify.
2. Page 3 Lines 81. Add reference.
3. Page 3 Lines 86-88. Is this treatment plan for both year? State clearly. The author (s) has/have a serious flaw while selecting fertilizer plan and varieties. Why did you selected two different varieties in two years? This clearly shows the reluctance of the investigator(s).
4. Page 3 line 89. Was land manually tilled or mechanized?
5. Page 3 line 91. At both cropping seasons is wrong. Rewrite as "In both cropping years".
6. Page 3 line 92. What about cultural practices and irrigation, either it was performed or not?
7. Page 3 line 93. Replace evaluated by calculated.

Results

1. The authors should at least read article before submitting. No, continuity in expression.
2. The author (s) has/have repeatedly mixed discussion in results section unnecessarily.
3. In whole results the authors didn't give even a single line from whom one can understand the % increase or decrease among different P application rates and both years. The authors must repeat the whole results and discussion.
4. The footnote of Table 2, 3, 5 and 6 create confusion. What is meant by vertical column and horizontal column? Column is always vertical and rows are horizontal. So clearly write like this.

Discussion

The data were poorly interpreted, organized and discussed. There is no synthesis of ideas but it is merely the recapitulation of results. Materials and methods unnecessarily repeated in discussion section. In general, the work suffers from junk of speculations. A number of vague ideas incorporated into the text (see page 7, number lines 176-178). The author(s) mixed everything together. Consequently, the manuscript is too wordy. This is also emanated from lack of selection of the major findings. Thus, rigorous edition of the manuscript may improve its quality in order to consider for publication in this journal.

References

None of the reference is according to journal format and a many references cited in text are missing in references.