



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_37891
Title of the Manuscript:	The Effect of Different Doses of Calcium Nitrate Applications on some Phytonutrient Element Contents of Leafy Parsley (Petroselinum crispum (Mill.)) Plant
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	- "Calcium is used in large amounts by plants second only to N and K" please check the grammar of the sentences and meaning. - There are several grammar mistakes. - The large part of the introduction section consists of literature survey. The aim and importance of the study was poorly explained. Instead of large explanations of literature survey authors should focus the aim and importance of the study and explain their hypothesis. - Stalk/Leaf ratio may affect determined concentration of elements in the experiment. Did you consider this point when you harvested plants? - Which digression method was used before ICP-OES analysis? - In the material and method section statistical analysis should explained clearly. One way or another? - Standard deviations of means should be given in Figures 1, 2, and Tables 3, 4. - Additionally, Figure 1 and Table 1, and, Figure 2 and Table 2 are same. They present same data. Please indicate differences which are presented with small letters and standard deviations (you didn't give before) in figures. You can add it to bars. - You mention "Nitrogen use efficiency" in the results section. Did you calculate it? There isn't any information about it in the material and method section and results. If you mean N uptake please use correct terminology! Please clear it. - The results and discussion section is very poor. It should be rewritten and supported and discussed by literature. - The text should be checked by an English expert. There are a lot of grammar mistakes such as using of wrong verbs, tenses and sentences.	Checked the grammar of the sentences and meaning. The introduction section rewritten. The material and method section rewritten. Detection limits for ICP-OES were given. An emphasis has been put on marking in the graphics. Figures renewed. The text checked by an English expert
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		