



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>)

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		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Language requires a major improvement. I cannot understand the meaning of "soil drenching" in title. The objectives are partly not adequate. This is the case of proposing to study the effects of foliar K applications on soil characteristics! Soil characteristics are not expected to vary with foliar applications. This could be interesting if the purpose of the study was to evaluate the effects of plant exudates after a foliar K fertilization. As well as, it is not well justified the use of a compost (not characterized, and no information on rate used), superphosphate and urea as basal applications in all plots. References used for K use efficiency determination are not appropriate. Please, see Moll et al. (1982). Agron J 74, and Carranca (2012). Sustainable Agriculture Reviews. Introduction is very weak and keywords should avoid repeating words in the title. Comments on results are deficiently addressed with some wrong interpretation. Discussion is very poor and mostly does not justify present data. Finally, Conclusions require a major revision because the effects on soil characteristics are not relevant. Tables should include footnotes with legends for symbols used and statistical treatment.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Corina Carranca
Department, University & Country	Instituto Nacional de Investigação Agrária e Veterinária, Portugal

