



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_32812
Title of the Manuscript:	RESPONSE OF FENUGREEK (TRIGONELLA FOENUM-GRAECUM L.) TO DIFFERENT LEVELS OF NITROGEN, PHOSPHORUS AND POTASSIUM
Type of the Article	Original research papers

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	Line 11: change "Standardized" to read....."standardizing" Line: 15 and Line 47: ...replace "was taken under"....with "was used" Line 56.... "The doses of fertilizer were adjusted....."were the levels adjusted or supplied by the said sources? Line 57: "laid out in factorial" what were the factors? According to the authors, there were 18 fertilizer treatments..... Line 59: there was an addition of FYM "FYM at 15 tonnes/ha. FYM, ½ dose of nitrogen.....FYM contains other nutrients apart from Nitrogen, how did the authors correct for this to achieve the desired levels of P and K that were under study? Why was FYM added? Line 65-66: "Data for both the years were pooled together and analyzed...." Why was this the case? Couldn't it be useful for the authors to first check whether there were any differences between the years? Line 70-71: If there were significant interactions between the different nutrients, then the authors cannot outlines results for a single nutrient in Lines 72-74; 84-89; 98-102; 111-117; 122-130. Hence the discussions do not hold and the authors should discuss the implication of the interaction effects..... Line 83...Number of secondary branches per plant.... where are these results presented? Line 121- The authors should use SI units in this section.....yield per ha and not per plot and hence should not have two tables i.e. one on per plot and the other on projections.	Compulsory revision 1. Line 57: It was clearly mentioned that factors are the 3 nutrients i.e. N, P and K. combination 3 doses of N and P and 2 doses of K, resulted the 18 treatment combination. 2. Line 59: Dose of FYM @ 15t/ha is the recommended dose for organic to maintain the soil health. FYM contain NPK in small quantity. It was uniform to all 18 treatments so, it will not become a problem for standardization of NPK under different agro-climatic zone. 3. Line 65-66: In some treatments there was difference for which it was pooled to arrive in definite conclusion.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	The Tables are too busy and need to be revised based on the comments on Line 65-66; 70-71; 72-74; 84-89; 98-102; 111-117; 122-130 Figure 1 has been presented and yet it is not been referred to anywhere in the text. Line 155-158: The authors have repeated the materials and methods instead of making conclusions based on the objectives Line 159-166: the authors have repeated the results Line 164- 165: "The yield attributing parameters like maximum number of pods per plant, pod length, number of seed per pod ".... this data has not been presented in the results section.....therefore cannot draw conclusions using these variables.	4. Line 70-71, 72-74, 84-89, 98-102, 111-117 and 122-130: the findings of this research article reflects two types of information i.e. sole effect of individual nutrient and interaction of the nutrients i.e. both two way and three way. Obviously conclusion was drawn through interaction effect for the interest of the growers. It will be more effective if B:C presented. 5. Line 83: It was incorporated 6. Line121: The yield /plot omitted 7. Fig 1: As per suggestion we omitted the yield/plot from the Table 3 and 4. In that connection we omitted that fig also as it was a combination of both yield/plot and yield/ha. 8. Line 155-158: It is not the repetition of Materials and Methods.
--	--	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

		9. Line 164-165, 159-166: Modified 10. Significance of data and level of significance: The level of significance was already mentioned i.e. CD (0.05) indicating 5% level. Except single parameter i.e. test weight. More than 90% data in both sole and interaction effect showed significant variation. Minor revision The SPSS16.0 software was used for statistical analysis, which I am mentioned in Materials and method. The 100 plants were maintained in 3m2 plot i.e. 20plants per row and 5 row per plot.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		