



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_29901
Title of the Manuscript:	Phosphorus Influence on Plant Tissue Nitrogen Contents and Yield Attributes of Finger Millet varieties in Semi-Arid Region of Kenya
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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	<p>For the whole paper: please check if this journal prefers kg/ha or kg ha⁻¹ and stick to one format. You use both. Also correct these in the figures and tables.</p> <p>Nitrogen content is low or high. (Most/least used for non-measurable things.)</p> <p>Numbers and units: space between and no hyphen e.g. 50 cm; 2 mm etc.</p> <p>Please check the journal's author guidelines. This is from their website: The abstract should be concise and informative. It should not exceed 300 words in length. It should briefly describe the purpose of the work, techniques and methods used, major findings with important data and conclusions. Different sub-sections should be used. No references should be cited in this part. Generally non-standard abbreviations should not be used, if necessary they should be clearly defined in the abstract, at first use.</p> <p>Check with journal et al. or <i>et al.</i>?</p> <p>Guideline for Reporting <i>P</i> values: <i>P</i> is always italicized and capitalized.</p> <p>i) Correct expression: (<i>P</i> = .05). Wrong Expression: (<i>P</i> < .05), unless <i>P</i> < .001.</p> <p>ii) The <i>P</i> value should be expressed to 2 digits whether or not it is significant. If <i>P</i> < .01, it should be expressed to 3 digits.</p> <p>iii) When rounding, 3 digits is acceptable if rounding would change the significance of a</p>	<p>Thank you for the guidance. They use kg ha⁻¹ and I have changed all to appear this way in main text, Figures and Tables. I have revised the wording and statements as advised. The different sub-sections on the abstract as I envisioned is more of a guideline because there would be no meaning in mentioning study design, place and duration of study and methodology separately yet can be summarized as one and also previous journals published indicate it as one. I have corrected the <i>P</i> value reporting as per the guidelines. The journal is not direct on the guideline for either et al. or <i>et al.</i> but will pick the latter considering your recommendation, published articles of the journal seem to have however used the former.</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>value (eg, $P = .049$ rounded to .05).</p> <p>iv) Expressing P to more than 3 significant digits does not add useful information since precise P values with extreme results are sensitive to biases or departures from the statistical model.</p> <p>v) Reporting actual P values avoids this problem of interpretation. P values should not be listed as not significant (NS) since, for meta-analysis, the actual values are important and not providing exact P values is a form of incomplete reporting.</p> <p>Suggestions per line: abstract – Never write in the first person e.g. “ we” or “I” .</p> <p>Ln 14 - ... important for its nutrition and resilience....</p> <p>Ln 16 - ... especially in calcium. It is a food crop in traditionally low input cereal-based farming...</p> <p>Ln 19- ... and it is cultivated on around 65 000 ha yr⁻¹.</p> <p>Ln 30 – ... balancing of mineral nutrients and utilization efficiency... OR ... balancing of mineral nutrients' utilization efficiency... (Depending on what you mean).</p> <p>Ln 47 – there seems to be a word missing. Not quite sure what you mean with: “...ecologies have been reported to marginally and hence the assumption...”</p> <p>Ln 55 – explain what ICRISAT stands for.</p> <p>Ln 71 and 72 – triple superphosphate and urea are common names, thus small letters.</p> <p>Ln 85- past tense of grind = ground (grounded has another meaning).</p> <p>Ln 86-87 ... nitrogen was determined by Kjeldahl... (more formal than 'done')</p> <p>References for Kjeldahl and Walkley Black methods??</p> <p>Ln 90 – Ca and Mg surely are macronutrients for plants?</p> <p>Ln 97 Data analyses (since you did more than one analysis?)</p>	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>Ln 108 – In the long rains There was no clear trend in accumulation of N in stems in response to P treatments during the long rains season.</p> <p>Ln 114- ...fragile lands such as those in Makueni ...</p> <p>Ln 126 (and other tables) ... are not statistically significantly different. I believe this is the more accepted way of writing it.</p> <p>Ln 129- ... N in all parts of the plant.</p> <p>Ln 132- Phosphorous and nitrogen... (common name)</p> <p>Ln 135- ... exhibited by varieties such as U-15.</p> <p>Ln 211 ... average production and it's its ideal to ...</p>	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		