



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 <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>
Compulsory REVISION comments	The authors evaluated the effects of combined application of poultry manure and NPK 15-15-15 (including their sole application) on growth and fresh foliar yield of waterleaf for two seasons in a Ultisol in southern Nigeria. The data collected and presented are interesting and, so, this is a potentially good paper for the readership of this Journal, if the authors do a major revision of the manuscript. I have identified some issues to be addressed especially in the following sections: 1. Materials and Methods (i) Poultry manure was incorporated into the soil during the preparation of raised seedbeds. To approximately what depth was this done, and how were the seedbeds prepared? (ii) Since the seedbeds were raised, how deep was the 1-m interplot spacing. In a tropical location as yours with annual rainfall of about 2,500 mm, rainstorm intensity may often exceed infiltration rate, leading to overland flow. One would therefore want to be sure that the 1-m pathways were deep enough to accommodate such flow, otherwise interplot flow might have occurred. (iii) What cultivar of waterleaf was used for the study? (iv) Going by the size of each treatment plot (6 m x 6 m) and by the plant spacing (5 cm x 5 cm), you had 14,400 plants per plot. You certainly did not sample all 14,400 plants. From how many plants were data collected and what were their positions in the plots?	1. Materials and Methods (i) The depth of the raised seedbeds and how they were prepared have been included in the text of the revised edition (see line 167). (ii) The depth has been reflected in the text. In any case, considering the nature of the soil, overflow was not a problem as it had high concentration of sand fraction. (iii) and (iv) the cultivar planted and sampling size per plot have been included (page 4 lines 169 and 178). (v) How the stem girth was measured has been described (see page 4 lines 180 and 181). 2. Results (vi) This has been reconciled (See text lines 188-269). (vii) and (viii) The units are now made to be consistent and the Tables have been merged (see text). 3. Discussion (ix) I disagree with this reviewer on his view about the strength of discussion of the results. In any case, I have retouched some aspects of the Discussion (see page 7 lines 292 -301, 310 -316). 4. Conclusion (x) I strongly disagree with the Reviewer's



SDI Review Form 1.6

	(v) Considering the small girth of waterleaf plants, you need to describe how the stem girth was measured. 2. Results (vi) Lines 157-159 (The ... plant.) in the Results section disagree with the tabulated data. (vii) Please be consistent in the style of ratio units you use. For example, kg ha⁻¹ may be preferred to kg/ha according to the style of this Journal. (viii) Please consider merging Tables 1 & 2, 3 & 4, 5 & 6, 7 & 8, and 9 & 10. 3. Discussion (ix) The results were generally weakly discussed. I encourage the authors to significantly improve the discussion of the results using relevant and current literatures. There are many of such literatures. 4. Conclusion (x) Finally, I am not comfortable with the conclusion of the paper vis-à-vis the data presented. In the first place, I agree to the scarcity and environmental problems associated with the use of mineral fertilizer in Nigeria. However, I also know that poultry manure is not available in large quantities in the country and that this, coupled with farmers' increasing awareness of its fertilizing qualities, understandably raises its cost. The authors should therefore have a re-think on the aspect of their conclusion related to this issue. Second, fresh foliage yield is, economically speaking, the most important parameter measured in this study. I therefore find it difficult to understand the reason for '... with or	availability of poultry manure in Nigeria, particularly southern part of the country. Firstly, he may be thinking of very large scale commercial poultry farms. Secondly, we don't know the extent to which he knows Nigeria but the truth is that after the ban of importation of frozen chicken by the Federal Government, there is huge increase and involvement of many people in poultry production such that some are even raised within residential areas. Therefore, we still stand by our conclusion Introduction section has been updated and improved. Other suggestions and comments made in the manuscript have been integrated in the revised edition of the paper.
--	--	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

	without supplementing with mineral fertilizer ...' in the Conclusion, when 3.75 tons PM ha ⁻¹ + 100 kg NPK ha ⁻¹ outyielded by over 2 times in both years of the study.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Many suggestions and comments are made in the manuscript itself. I encourage the authors to consider integrating them in the revision.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		