



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_43110
Title of the Manuscript:	Response of grain Amaranth (Amaranthus hypochondriacus) to combined manure and inorganic fertilizer pellets and non-pellet application on acidic acrisols in Western 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>The title of the manuscript brings unnecessary information, which is not the focus of the work. In the case of a work for international publication, avoid locations in the title. As a suggestion, I would remove the part "on acidic acrisols in Western Kenya" (this part of the title does not represent the main idea of the manuscript) and would add plant growth. As a suggestion for the title: Response of growth and grain yield of Amaranth (A. hypochondriacus) to combined manure and inorganic fertilizer pellets and non-pellet application. The aim of the abstract is different from the aim described in the introduction. Rephrase the aim of the manuscript, especially in the introduction. The overall abstract is good. In the introduction the authors use almost a whole paragraph talking about the country Kenya, being more interesting to bring a theoretical reference on the pelletized fertilizers, this subject, more connected to the results of the manuscript. All references used in the manuscript are very old, the youngest is at least 6 years ago. The authors should carry out an update of the references used in this work. In the material and methods it is unnecessary to explain how the soil was sampled, since it is already a standard used and known. It would be more interesting to put the result of the analysis than the description of the sampling. In the material and methods the authors present the soil sample of 0-20cm and 20-40cm, but in the results they use samples of 0-15cm and 15-30cm. In treatment 5 it was missing how many kg of inorganic N was used. The authors do not identify the CAN fertilizer, and should present the % of nutrients present in this fertilizer. Apparently in treatment 3 the authors exchanged the unit Kg for t. In the methodology it was not necessary to describe how the analysis was done in the laboratory to know the constituents present in manure and fertilizers used as treatment. In the results and discussion the authors present the soil analysis as a result, but it is only a description of the soil, and must enter into the methodology of the manuscript. In the methodology, Treatment 2 possesses 22kg of inorganic N, but in table 2 of the result the treatment is identified with 83.25 kg of CAN. Authors should standardize the measures as this brings confusion to the reader. What is the percentage of each nutrient in CAN? Some doubts arose, such as: How did the N value of manure in Table 1 give 0.83% and in treatment 1 that is only manure gave 2.45%? How is the value of N greater in treatment 1 than in treatment 5 which is inorganic? Why did iron get higher on treatment 2 than with CAN and manure together? In the course of the text the authors instead of using the number of treatments (T1, T2, T3,) they use the weight of the fertilizer to identify each treatment, this leaves the text tiring to the reader, besides making it difficult to read of the tables. Although the authors have put in the material and methods the use of statistics, in the results no mean test is presented to compare the results between the treatments. The coefficient of variation is also not shown. Neither the value of r or the trend line of the graph equation. The graphics are very confusing, the reader has difficulty identifying each treatment. Standardize the display of subtitles in graphics. Table 4 is confused and does not present the statistical difference between the means. In the last 3.5 of the results it was difficult to understand the relationship between production and growth parameters, discuss better. The conclusion was good, maybe shorten the text.</p>	<p>The title has been changed as suggested. The introduction has been aligned to the objectives. The principle of pelleting has been added to give the theoretical background.. The sampling depth has been corrected to be 0-15 cm and 15-30 cm. The treatments have been correctly stated and the mistakes corrected. . The soil characteristics have been added to the methodology insteady of being results. The mistakes in the anlysis of the pellets have been corrected. We have used weight of the fertilizers so that it easier for one the use the results than refering back and foth on what is T1 T2 etc. We have added footnotesin all the tables what T1 and T2 are for quick referecing. All the tables have LSD values which are used in comparing the means.</p>
Minor REVISION comments	<p>The keywords "fertilizer pellet" is already in the title, and is unnecessary for indexing, since the key word "Protein malnutrition" is not an essential key word for the work, considering that protein malnutrition is presented only in the introduction, the work does not bring any novelty regarding the protein in amaranthus species.</p>	<p>The keywords have been changed. Fertilizer pellet, protein malnutrition, have been deleted. Acidic acrisols and tropics have been added as other key words for indexing.</p>
Optional/General comments		