



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2014_AJEA_8944
Title of the Manuscript:	Yield and yield component of chickpea as affected by boron
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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	1-) The literature is not enough in the study. 2-) There are some deficiencies in the materials and methods section. For example, there were not given any information about soil features of experiment field and climatic data of experiment year. The observations, determined in this study, were done according to which literature, there are not any information in the text. There were not given any enough information about chickpea varieties. A literature on statistical methods has not been given. Significance levels of F values were not given in the text. 3) Generally, only results of this study are given in the results and discussion section of the manuscript. Discussion is quite weak. 4-) Abstract should be revised. And it should be written again. 5-) Valenciano et al was not given in literature list. 6-) The researcher should be aware of abbreviations.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Oral DÜZDEMİR
Department, University & Country	Department of Biology, Cankiri Karatekin University, Turkey