



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2013 AJEA 3297
Title of the Manuscript:	The Efficiency of Nitrogen Fertilization of Spring Wheat Depending on Seasonal Rainfall

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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	I read through this manuscript a couple of time before actually editing. The introduction seems to wonder and does not directly address many of the issues that the experiment was designed to do. I have made some suggestions in the actual manuscript, which I am sending along. The objectives need to be better defined and more specific. Rainfall differences among years cannot be an experimental factory and should not be included in the objectives or Materials and Methods as treatment factors. Weather patterns can be used to explain the results or differences in results among years. The main thing with this experiment is that it was designed to develop an optimal nitrogen rate for wheat. Catch crops are introduced as an experimental factor, but no reasoning why the field pea and radish were used. But, more importantly , the nitrogen fertilizer treatments are confounded with both N rates and N application times. The entire discussion, as far as I could see was developed around N rates. How does the author know that the split applications of N did	The objective has been improved. Answer: I agree. Weather conditions were not the experimental factor. Thus the objective of the study has been improved according to the suggestion. Moreover, weather description has been moved from the materials and methods section to the results section. It has been improved in the introduction section. I know, of course, that the effect of N is dependent on N rate as well as its way of split and application time. Thus the way of N application has been clearly presented in the material and methods section. I agree that it is



SDI Review Form 1.6

	not have an effect on the outcome? The other things I mentioned above and in the manuscript itself can be fixed with a major rewrite, but the confounding is a completely different matter and I am not sure how the author will get around that.	necessary to consider the effect of these aspects of N application in discussion section. In the revised manuscript this aspect has been substantially improved in the subsection of discussion entitled "Grain yield of spring wheat and its structure"
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	I have made a number of suggestions in the text of the manuscript, at least in the introduction and Materials and Methods	Suggestions made in the text have been considered in the improved manuscript.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The author needs to make sure they use technical terminology and not local jargon in this scientific paper. Thing like "good supply" or "rich" are localized terms that mean something different to different readers. Using precise and technical terms will help the reader understand what the author is trying to communicate. Determine and explain why you did the experiment, describe how you did it, then present and discuss your results. Maybe there is a place in the discussion for some of the extra ideas and thoughts not directly related to the results, maybe not. Where that information is placed in the manuscript or if it should be there at all will affect the quality of the scientific manuscript.	Mentioned terminology used in the manuscript has been substantially improved. In my opinion my improved manuscript is substantially closer to the assumption presented by the reviewer