



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Agriculture and Ecology Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAERI_25052
Title of the Manuscript:	N:P RATIOS IN ESTIMATING NUTRIENT LIMITATION OF A COASTAL BAY IN SOUTHERN ADRIATIC SEA
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
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	English and the organization of the sentences must be thoroughly reviewed. Furthermore, there are too many repetitions and Journal format is not fully complied with. The Authors claim that "The first aim of this study was to estimate limiting nutrient of phytoplankton primary production basing on N/P ratios in surface waters of Durres Bay", but it is unclear why phytoplankton, because it is not given any comparison with the chl and they do not tell anything of this bay, depth, etc. Important results would be to check the concentration of chl in relation to the amount of N and P, also with respect to the open sea, and the differences of the phytoplankton species due to variations of the ratio N/P In particular, I report below some suggestions: Line 32 – are you sure the sentence is/was accepted in the field of phytoplankton? It would be appropriate to cite specific papers for marine plants Lines 47-53 - I would simplify, distinguishing in points Lines 52-53 – it seem redundant Line 55 - it lacks a brief description of the study area Line 55 - It seems to be excessive the use of "&" in place of "and". Change everywhere. Line 56 – according to Lines 55-61 - it starts from analysis to arrive at the sampling: logic would dictate events were reported to the	I want to thank you for all opinions, that were so clear to correct the manuscript. Your comment are so helpful for me. I have highlight to yellow all changing. Your comments were so appropriate to me. You are the best editor I have ever known, even I don't know your name. Thank very much for your support.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	contrary Lines 68-70 – is it important to return the data in two different units? Why not just use the moles? “The data are converted not only on mg/L but also on molar concentration of NO₃-N & PO₄-P to calculate N/P ratios according ICES” change in “NO₃-N and PO₄-P results were expressed in μM”. N/P is an atomic ratio, so it is pretty obvious data must be expressed in moles Line 73 – (NO₃) change in (NO₃-N); & = and Line 78 – “...are considered higher” or “...are higher” ? Lines 84-85 –this sentence is really obvious and does not clarify exceedingly Lines 89-90 – delete this sentence Line 91 - there are too many units of measurement. To make it easier to read they should be uniformed. I suggest to use only μM (= μmol L⁻¹ =mmol/m³). Because the values reported are averages, it would be appropriate to include the standard deviation (±SD) Line 92 - to NO₃-N (0.008 mg/L) of surface open waters in Southern Adriatic Sea (NO₃ 92 - = 0.57 mmol/m³) Lines 93-94 – delete ices and what is in brackets Lines 100 and over – use ±SD Lines 112 – it is not evident, it is probable .. it is likely Lines 117-118 – delete. They are used too frequently repetitive rituals sentences Lines 120-122 – the same (preceding paragraph) Lines 136-141 - It is true that the N/P ratio expresses limiting values, but it is equally true that the nutritional framework is of wide availability. This should be dealt with better, even using quotations Line 146 - ±SD Lines 146-147 - I understand that you used "co-limiting" to mean optimum balance for phytoplankton according	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	to Redfield. I suggest to clarify the concept to the reader Lines 154-155 – Table 1. Use only μM , delete mg/L. Insert $\pm\text{SD}$ Lines 157-159 – ritual sentence Lines 161-164 – it is true, but the concept must be deepened: In a context of abundant availability, low N/P ratio may favor some opportunistic species rather than others Lines 167-168 - but we know what's what!! Lines 169-170 – ritual. Delete Lines 185-199 - Conclusions are mostly a summary of what said above	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		