



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 (<i>Petroselinum crispum</i> (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	1- The written format of abstract section is not proper for abstract writing. 2- In the introduction section, the main reason of Calcium use in parsley, relation to calcium and parsley growing, also nutrient uptake must be clearly explained via using literature. Only writing the general effects of calcium on any plants is not be adequate to explain the reason of conducting this research. Introduction section is poor. In this section the hypothesis of the study is not writing by using literature. The author was written some study examples as literature presentation but relations of these studies and this research are not clearly presented. 3- The material metod section also written very poor, for exp.: in this section the application style of calcium to parley plants was not given, how the authors were applied calcium nitrate?. Irrigation of the plants were not mentioned. The methods used for analyze the macro and micro nutrient element content of plants was not clearly mentioned. For ex: How many or much simple was used?, whats the steps of analyze?, how many replicate was used? etc. 4- Result and discussion section is very inadequate. Especially with the results mentioned and literature given as discussed have not clearly relation. Just only some sentences were written as discuss section like "Calcium nitrate applications increased the contents of Ca, K and P of leaves in potato plant [18]" given in lines 117-118, but no any combination and relation with this sentence and result was written. 5- Conclusion section is written as a short, general, abstract, so this section is too poor. 6- In "Figure 2 and table 3" and also in "Figure 3 and table 4" the same data were used. So, it is not needed to use the same data in both figure and table, please prefer to use one of it (Figure or table)	The introduction section rewritten. Reviewer's comment pointed to the article were made. The material method section rewritten.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	The study has not any originality. There have lots of such studies in the literature and I do not see any added value of another one. The importance and the differences with others of this research must be exactly mentioned. The manuscript was written very simple it must be detailed and improved. This kind of researches must be conducted in lab conditions or under fully controlled conditions for to determine the exact effect of the factor used.	The study is an original research on parsley in Turkey.