



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

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 Article:	Original Research Article

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
THE REVISED MANUSCRIPT SHOWS THAT THE AUTHORS DID NOT TAKE CONSIDERATION THE REVIEWERS COMMENTS. The english of the paper is improper, so the language of the manuscript must be edited by an editing office. 1- Still in the revised manuscript unproper format used. In abstract section subtitles must not be used. The written format of abstract section is not proper for abstract writing. 2- In this section the hypothesis of the study is not clearly presented by using literature. And still in revised manuscript it was not clearly explained why its needed to use calcium on parsley. Introduction section is still poor. 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 3- As seen in revised paper, the authors did not take consideration the reviewer's comments. So nothing was added new to the this section. STILL THE PROBLEM GOES ON IN THIS SECTION. 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 analize the macro and micro nutrient element content of plants were not clearly mentioned. For ex: How many or much simple was used?, whats the steps of analize?, how many replicate was used? etc. 4- In revised manuscript nothing was added and revised related to the reviewers comments Result and discussion section is very 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 "<i>Calcium nitrate applications increased the contents of Ca, K and P of leaves in potato plant [18]</i>" given in lines 117-118, but no any combination and relation with this sentence and result was written. 5- NOT IMPROVED Conclusion section is written as an short, general, abstract, so this section is too poor. 6- IT'S GIVEN AS THE SAME BEFORE, NO ANY CORRECTIONS WERE DONE. In "Figure 2 and table 3" and also in "Figure 3 and table 4" the same data were used.	1- Abstract section was rewritten according to journal style. 2- Introduction section was corrected reviewer comments. 3- Material and method section was corrected reviewer comments. 4- Result and discussion section was corrected reviewer comments. 5- Conclusion section was corrected reviewer comments.



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

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)

GENERAL COMMENT FOR MANUSCRIPT:
Conducting this research in Turkey does not indicate that this research is original.