



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	MS: 2013_AJEA_3172
Title of the Manuscript:	Contributions of Short Duration Legume Fallow to Maize (<i>Zea mays</i> L.) Varieties under Different Nitrogen Levels in a Semi-Arid Environment.

General guideline for Peer Review process is available in this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

- This form has total 9 parts. Kindly note that you should use all the parts of this review form.



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2: 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. Material and Methods part is very confusing and difficult to comprehend. Please be more specific and descriptive with the layout of the experiments. Maybe a figure or a flowchart would help to get a better understanding of the experiment. 2. The Results chapter is too long, monotonous, and repetitive. Please reorganise it (for example <i>N treatment</i>, <i>Green manure treatment</i> and <i>Combined treatments</i> like in the Discussion part) and significantly (at least by 50%) shorten it. Avoid using filling sentences like the starting sentence of each subchapter (lines 119, 131, 150, etc.) 3. Discussion. Please shorten. Avoid using "genetically superior" expression (line 335) and contradicting yourself in the next sentence (line 339) or in conclusion. The organisation of the chapter is very good. The conclusion is not very good. A conclusive paragraph with the take home message, highlighting the relevance of this study, seems missing at the moment. 4. Tables. Too much information presented in not a very good way. The tables should contain much more description, thus to be more self-explanatory. What is the meaning of the $SE \pm$ row in all tables? Why there is no relation between the data from the Tables 5 and 6? Where the numbers of the Table 6 come from? But the layout of the Table 6 to my mind is the best for this study. Please, average annual data sets and present all the tables from 2 to 5 like the	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	table 6 (average $\pm$ SE), so the reader can see the interaction from the very beginning.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Viktor Tóth
Department, University & Country	Hydrobotany, Hungarian academy of Sciences Ecological Research Centre Balaton Limnological Institute