



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Soil Science and Plant Nutrition
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJSSPN_42631
Title of the Manuscript:	The effect of potassium from different sources applied as foliar spray and soil drenching on the nutrients' status of the saline calcareous soil, yield, and quality of carrot (Daucus carota L.)
Type of the Article	Original research paper

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 Required revision	1) Very interesting research and useful for the industry. However, my concerns are below: 2) The title is too long and lack clarity. I suggest changing to "Effect of different sources and application method of potassium on the nutrient status of calcareous soil, and carrot root yield and quality" 3) Abstract needs to be re-written. Author mentioned 1 and 2 as rates...meaning? 4) Compost was not in the title and yet it was part of the treatments. 5) What do you mean by non-significant for most of the treatments in the abstract? 6) Introduction: Lacks clarity. Excessive use of "the" making reading very difficult. Some statements are not relevant. Grammar and sentence structure needs to be corrected throughout the text. Objective not clear and the last paragraph are not helpful. 7) Materials and Methods: This section is not detailed enough for replication. Amount of treatments were mentioned but not rates...are they per ha or what? Description of experimental treatments were not clear. What do you mean by: ...sowing was done in 2016 and/or 2017? Why do you have different rates for K₂O for the different K sources? IT must be the same for comparison. What are the specifications of the instruments used? This is a 3-factor experiment, but the author used split-plot, which I am concern about. Also, the statistical analysis did not account for any interactions. I am therefore, not convinced with the presented results and discussion and conclusion.	1) Thank you very much for his/her time and effort revising our manuscript. All comments will be considered. 2) The title is modified as recommended 3) Abstract was re-written. 4) Compost was mentioned in the abstract, materials and methods and throughout the text. It is not mentioned the title to avoid a too long title. 5) The unclear sentence may need some details. So, it is deleted. 6) Introduction was revised, modified and grammar corrected. Objective was clarified. 7) Materials and Methods section was re-written, rates were defined (600 and 1200 g K₂O/ha). Some information was revised and corrected. Instruments specifications were added. 8) By asking a statistical specialist, she advised to consider the experiment as two independent parts; with and without compost depending on the performance at field. Each part consists of a main factor (K-sources) and sub-factor (rates of application). Therefore, it was statically analysed as a split-plot design. Results were discussed on this basis.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		