



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	MS: 2012/AJEA/2513
Title of the Manuscript:	Enhancing Dry Season Production of Indian Spinach (<i>Basella Alba</i>) Through Fertigation

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 <i>(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)</i>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	I found the article original, and very important to Nigeria's agriculture. I recommend this for publication after only some minor revisions.	Ok
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<u>The Abstract</u> gives an overall knowledge of the research. The objective was well written, but the treatments description hadn't been clear. For example, what does it ("W and P") means? And, it is necessary to finish with the conclusion of the study: which is the most appropriated poultry manure rates for spinach production in Nigeria's soils? <u>The Introduction section</u> needs more attention. I think it can be improved detailing the poultry manure benefits on soil properties as well as for Indian Spinach production. High N contents in poultry manure must be highlighted as a good organic fertilizer for the low fertility's soils of Nigeria. The objective is clear. <u>The Material and Methods</u> section is well written, but it must be more detailed, for example: Line 57: Experimental sites are poor detailed: clime classification according Koppen (precipitation rates, humidity of air), soil's classification. Line 62: ...poultry manure was collected and sieved (which sieve)? Poultry manure were collected and applied as fertigation? Or, some treatments were done before been applied? Line 73: It is important to include was W and P means.	Corrections have been effected. Added Corrected All corrections have been effected.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	The authors only explain it in Line 78. Line 79: There were five treatments. Line 80: Twenty (5 treatments X 4 replicates). Line 95: remove end point Line 97: It must change distillation to digestion. Line 98: It is lacking the Reference for Kjeldahl method. Line 102: NaOH. Line 104: Muffle. Line 107: Fat content is not described. Line 122: Fisher's Test. <u>The Discussion and Results</u> section must be improved. Line 125: I think the soils fertility results must be shown in Tables form. The units are not according SI: $\text{cmol}_c \text{ kg}^{-1}$ soil, instead of C mol/kg; pH instead of Ph. Line 131: What is OC? It must be clear. Line 135: Discussion should be rewrite. It is confused. Line 146 and 163: Mineralization. Line 177: The Title is not adequate, it is lacking information.	Kjeldahl is a popular method that needs no reference All corrections have been effected
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		