



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_44818
Title of the Manuscript:	Doses of magnesium sulphate in productivity of oil palm (Elaeis guineensis)
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	The manuscript is good and it gives scope for other researchers to work on but the some corrections are required in Results and discussion parts of the manuscript, results of the findings should be discussed by providing necessary references, where ever required. 1. It is appropriate to change the manuscript title to 'Effect of different doses of magnesium sulphate on productivity of oil palm' instead of 'Doses of magnesium sulphate in productivity of oil palm'.	The results were discussed in the manuscript. The title of the article has been changed.
Minor REVISION comments	The text should be published with minor changes listed below. - Line 7: Change 'The experimental design.....' to 'The experiment was laid out in randomized block design, consisting of five treatments viz., magnesium sulphate @ 0 g plant⁻¹, 500 g plant⁻¹, 1000 g plant⁻¹,1500 g plant⁻¹ and 2000 g plant⁻¹ with three replications. Soil samples were collected from two depths i.e., 20 and 40 cm before the treatments imposition for laboratory analysis. After soil sample collection, treatments were applied manually twice, with an interval of 6 months.' - The superficial application of magnesium sulphate in the projection of the copa.... Copa means? Crop? Correct it. - Change 'g plant-1' to 'g plant⁻¹'. - The dose of 1000 g plant-1 allowed an increase of 15 % by weight of bunches of fresh fruits in relation to witness. This behavior was also observed for the variable productivity, presenting significant effect ($P<0.05$) with respect to witness, suiting the quadratic equation.....not clear, change it. - This study showed that application of magnesium sulphate in the cultivation of oil palm in dose 1000 g plant -1..... changed to 'This study showed that application of magnesium sulphate in the cultivation of oil palm at the rate of 1000 g plant⁻¹....' - Line 14: The oil palm (<i>Elaeis guineensis</i>) has as its center of origin of the african continent, but has been cultivated in the Amazon region because of its climatic characteristics.....changed to 'The oil palm (<i>Elaeis guineensis</i>) has its center of origin of the African continent, but has been cultivated in the Amazon region because of its similar climatic characteristics' - Line 16: Gomes Junior et al [1] of the fruits of the palm oil are extracted from the changed to 'Gomes et al [1], the fruits of the palm oil are used to extract the ...' - Line 25: rape girassol.....check it? - Line 27: ha / t changed to ha t⁻¹ - Line 27: size less than that required for these crops....incomplete sentence, correct the sentence. - Line 28: óleo vegetal.....? - Line 29: Palma changed to 'Palm' - Line 31: 165,000 thousand hectares.....Check the figure. - Line 34: cultivation of culture changed to 'cultivation of oil palm' - Line 40: Mg+2 changed to Mg²⁺ - Line 44: cakmak And lazici [8] the deficiency magnesiana changed to 'cakmak and lazici [8] the deficiency magnesium' - Line 47, 49 & 255: CO2 changed to 'CO₂' - Line 53: consequente? - Line 54: fornecimeno? - Line 57: effect of doses changed to 'effect of different doses' - Line 72 & 88: (MgSO4-H2O).....changed to '(MgSO4 H2O)'	The changes suggested by the reviewer were reviewed, made and corrected throughout the manuscript. Cupping projection was replaced by: in the root zone of treated plants The corrections for subscript and superscript were changed in the manuscript as requested Some paragraphs have been taken from the text for the sake of textual coherence. Paragraphs were rewritten in the introduction and results and discussion in the manuscript as requested by the reviewer. Portuguese words were corrected for English in the text. Suggested corrections for plant spacing were corrected in the manuscript at the request of the reviewer. All corrections suggested by the reviewer were made within the manuscript.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	22. Line 74: KIESERITE changed to 'kieserite' 23. Line 78: Delhineamento....? 24. Line 79: The experiment was mounted in field conditions in area of cultivation of three years of age. In an area of approximately 2.6 ha⁻¹. changed to 'The experiment was selected in field conditions in area of cultivation of three years of age with an area of approximately 2.6 ha⁻¹' 24. Line 81: between plants per 9 m.....changed to 'between plants 9 m' 25. Line 82: plants/ha⁻¹ changed to 'plants ha⁻¹' 26. Line 84: magnesium sulphate soil.....changed to 'magnesium sulphate soil application' 27. Line 87, 146, 166, 202, 282 & 285: MgSO4 changed to 'MgSO₄' 28. Line 91: Parceladamento ? 29. Line 94: installation of the experiment.....changed to 'application of the treatments of the experiment' 30. Line 96: (COPA).....? 31. Line 101: Granulometric.....check the spelling 32. Line 102: before the installation of the experiment.....changed to 'before the application of treatments of the experiment' 33. Line 102: in table- 'Layer'... changed to 'Depth of the soil (cm)', PH ...changed to 'pH', CTC....changed to CEC and the units used must be SI unit system, please change. 34. Line 114: (t/ha/year) changed to '(t ha⁻¹ year⁻¹)' 35. Line 115 & 116: During the period of the completion of the experiment were collected in the company Marborges climatic data.....changed to 'The climatic data during the period of the experiment was collected from the Marborges company' 36. Line 117: Termohigrômetro correct the spelling. 37. Line 118: presented in Figure 3....changed to 'presented in Figure 1' 38. Line 120 & 121: Figure 1- monthly temperature and precipitation monthly, during the years of 2014 and 2015 in DEMIJOHNS of north-PA, Brazil....changed to 'Figure 1- Average monthly temperature and precipitation during 2014 and 2015 in Demijohns of north-PA, Brazil.' 39. Line 121: Figure depicted in local language, kindly change if possible. 40. Line 128: magnesium sulphate in....changed to 'magnesium sulphate on' 41. Line 135: We can observe that the municipality of DEMIJOHNS of....changed to 'From the figure 1, the municipality of Demijohns of' 42. Line 136: temperature of the air changed to 'ambient temperature' 43. Line 143: 2015 this rainfall variation was even greater for the second half of 1997....where is 1997 weather data? Why 2015 rainfall data comparing with 1997 rainfall data? 44. Line 149: experiment showed , characterized by acidic....changed to 'experiment characterized by acidic' 45. Line 152: cmolc/dm-3....mention SI units. 46. Line 154: CTC....changed to CEC 47. Line 167: year of 2015 in relation to witness....change the sentence, mention appropriate word instead of witness. 48. Line 170: in figure- R2....changed to 'R²' 49. Line 179: 1370 g plant -1 MgSO4....changed to '1370 g MgSO₄ plant⁻¹' 50. Line 210: ha-1 changed to 'ha⁻¹' 51. Figure 3 and Figure 4, the dose ideal mentioned differently, 52. Line 223: The discussion should be with similar crop as far as possible. 53. Line 230 : magnesiana changed to 'magnesium' 54. Line 232 & 243: Marborges DEMIJOHNS changed to 'Marborges Demijohns' 55. Line 233: plantations of oil palm plantations....changed to 'plantations of oil palm' 56. Line 240: Mg be reduced.....changed to 'Mg reduced' 57. Line 247: solar energy incident....changed to 'incident solar energy' 58. Line 250: Rubisco....changed to 'RUBISCO'	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	59. Line 253: ribulose 1-5- bifosfato.....check the spelling and mention correct spelling. 60. Line 253: CARBOXYLASE....changed to 'Carboxylase' 61. Line 253: oxigenasse....check the spelling. 62. Line 254: mg changed to 'Mg' 63. Line 259: water in the soil....changed to 'water from the soil' 64. Line 260: Gomes Junior....changed to 'Gomes' 65. Line 263: concentrated in layers of 0-20 and 20-40 cm of soil....support with suitable reference. 66. Line 265: sulfate ion SO_4^-.....changed to 'sulfate ion SO_4^{2-}' 67. Line 266: of Ca^{3+} changed to 'Ca^{2+}' 68. Line 266: less toxic if the plants....changed to 'less toxic to the plants' 68. Line 269: descent....changed to 'leaching' 69. Line 273: multienzimático....? 70. Line 274: óleaginosas.....? 71. Line 274: conheita.....? 72. Line 279: fornecimeno....? 73. Line 283 to 286: pre-requisite for obtaining a high income in the bunch, significantly decreased the gear oil, bunch....correct the paragraph, it is quite confusing and meaningless. 74. Line 290: Cultura....?change with suitable word. 75. Line 291: 1000 g plant⁻¹ ? is it the conclusion dose, check it with previous discussion. 76. Line 297: 1.Gomes Junior R.....changed to '1.Gomes J R,' 77. Line 324: 8. Cakmak I, Kirby AND A.....check and correct. 78. In references, correct according to the journals rules. Change the capitals to small letters, except abbreviations, surnames .etc.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Evaluation of the effects various doses of magnesium sulphate on productivity of oil palm is important contribution to the science. I think that the data was adequately obtained and analyzed. However, I suggest that the text should be print with minor corrections.	The suggestions suggested by the reviewer were accepted and run within the manuscript, bound by considerations.