



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 (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		
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	ABSTRACT - Results 2011 not very well articulated .Please re write in more clear words. - Avoid using pronouns in scientific writing for example "But we have to emphasis...that could read Emphasis must be made.... - At the end of the abstract, come up with a sentence on the importance of this study to the scientific world. How does the study contribute to the recent scientific knowledge and how does it improve the systems or change them. - Molar concentrations of N and P must be presented with figures so that readers are well informed of the measure that is recommended or not recommended. TITLE - Consider changing the title to" Estimation of N/P ratios or levels in coastal Bay, Southern..... - This is so because during the estimation the study obviously intends to estimate ratios/levels that are allowable and cannot harm aquatic life and at the same time the study intends to isolate	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	figures that are harmful so these will be covered in the study no need to include in the title ... INTRODUCTION • The second aim of the study should as well become another main study or be used as reference in this study. I don't think it is important /relevant to this study. • The third objective is not clear what it wants to address, re write in simpler words easier to understand by all reading your work. Its obviously very hard to discern what the researcher wants to do. METHODOLOGY • Am just questioning why getting samples from May-Oct (2011) and June-Oct (2012) not uniform like May-Oct (2011) and May-Oct (2012). My take is do you think climatic or weather conditions have affected results????? RESULTS AND DISCUSSION I have not learnt how the results of the present study are relevant to the aquatic life which is the essence of this study. It is very silent how aquatic life would be impacted And the overall management procedure to maintain N/P ratios. The author should not just present figures in results but explain and translate them into real situations. How the levels of N/P affect phytoplankton abundance, species composition, the food web as well as implications to livelihood benefiting from such water bodies.	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	What recommendations have we drawn from the study?? I declare that I have no competing interest as a reviewer” ?? No section for that????	
--	---	--

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Kumbukani Mzengereza</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Department of fisheries sciences, Mzuzu university, Malawi</i>