



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2012 AJEA 2599
Title of the Manuscript:	GROWTH AND FOLIAR YIELD RESPONSES OF WATERLEAF (<i>Talinum triangulare</i> JACQ) TO COMPLEMENTARY APPLICATION OF ORGANIC AND INORGANIC FERTILIZERS ON AN ULTISOLS

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	Page 1, line 4 - Why is the “ultisols” so important that the authors must stated in the manuscripts? I do not see any correlation between “ultisols” and the treatments or the results. Please give the explanation! Page 2, line 48-56 - Is the following sentences needed here: Waterleaf is therefore.....edikang ikong. Page 3, line 68 – Is it leaf vegetable or leafy vegetable? Page 3, line 68 – Most farmers.....(Daudal et al., 2008). Did Steward et al. or Daudal et al mentioned or wrote about waterleaf? If not, please delete from the text. Page 3, line 82 – Inform – correct: information Page 4, line 92-101 – Is the following sentences needed here: Application of organic.....organic fertilizer. Please be concise! No need to write any sentences that do not give any information. Page 4, line 101 – Objective – This study was....Uyo, Nigeria. Move this sentence to line 91 after(Ndaeyo et al., 2005).	Page 1, Line 4-The inclusion of ‘ultisols’ is important because it at once gives an idea of the soil group type where the study was conducted. Page 2, Line 48-56- The sentences are needed but these have been re-written in line with the Reviewer's comment (see page 1lines 48 and 49). Page 3, Line 68- It is a leafy vegetable (see page1 line 44). Page 3, Line 68- I could not delete because Dauda worked on vegetable while Steward generally considered the contribution of fertilizer nutrients in crop production. I consider these relevant to my study. Page 3, Line 82- It has been corrected as ‘information’ see page 3 line 105. Page 4, Line 92- 101- These have been deleted and addressed accordingly. Page 4, Line 101- These have been addressed accordingly (see page 3 and lines130 and131).



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Page 4, line 106 – Please give a specific time for early cropping season. What month? Page 5, line 120 – Please give an explanation about control? Specified the treatment as a control in (...) Page 5, line 127 – Please stated the harvesting time for the yield. Is it 3, 6, 9, or 12 WAP? Is it sequence harvesting or only at the end of the planting season? In my opinion, this is important because the conclusion should be based on yield, so the authors can give a proper fertilizer rate recommendation. Page 5 – 8, line 131 -194 - Results – Please be concise when wrote about results. When the authors want to point out the result that higher or highest, please defines how much higher (e.g., 30 % higher than ... or compared to....). If the result from 2009 and 2010 consistently same, the authors can state in the same sentence (e.g., The treatment produced 25 % taller plant height compared to other treatment in both years). Page 8, line 199 – 400 kg/ha treatment. What treatment? Page 8, line 200 – 100 kgha⁻¹ NPK or better to write 100 kg NPK ha⁻¹? Page 8, line 206 – 208 - Is the following sentence needed here: This also Plant/soil systems. Page 8, line 215 – 217 – Is the following sentence needed here: Also combined.... micro nutrients.	Page 4, Line 106- this has been done (see page 3 line 144). Page 5 , Line 120- this has been done (see page 4 lines 164 and165). Page 5, Line 127- this has been done (see page 4 line182). Pages 5-8, Line 131-194- these have been done (see pages 4 -6 lines 191 -213, 219-238, 247-255). Page 8, line 199 – This has been done (see page 4 line 162 - 165). Page 8, line 200 -This has been done (see the entire text). Page 8, line 206 – 208 -This has been deleted. Page 8, line 215 – 217 -This has been deleted.
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Page 9, line 219-222 - Is the following sentence needed here: Aliyu (2000) and Dauda et al. (2008), respectively. Page 9, Conclusion – It is better if the author can provide the reader with fertilizer rate recommendation to produce the highest foliage yield. Page 12 – 13 – Table 1, 2, 3, and 4 – Please check again the data in the table. It seems something wrong. If I am not mistaken for example Table 1, there are data about height. In common sense, height is a growth parameter which always increases day by day. But, please take a look for the PM only treatment. The treatment gave 10.90 cm at 9 WAP, but 9.83 cm at 12 WAP. How come the height decreased?	Page 8, line 219 – 222 -This has not been deleted because they are relevant to our work Page 9- This has been done (see 321 -324). Page 12 – 13 – Table 1, 2, 3, and 4 –There is nothing wrong. This is because harvesting was not done once but sequentially at 3. 6, 9 and 12 WAP which explains their differences in height and others.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	- Consistent with the unit for fertilizer treatment. Is it tha^{-1} or t/ha?	This has been done.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	This manuscript is a research article which presents us with the evidence that higher yield of waterleaf can be obtained by organic+inorganic fertilization.	