



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2013_AJEA_3649
Title of the Manuscript:	AN INVESTIGATION OF THE CONTENT OF MANGANESE IN THE FRUIT OF MARROWS IN RESPECT OF THE KIND OF FERTILIZER AND THE TYPE OF FERTILIZATION

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 7 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	I studied manuscript; the data presented is not enough for reviewing. The objective of this study is to determine the manganese content in the fruit of marrows in foliar fertilization with Fitona 0.3%, Hortigrow 0.3 %, Humustim 0.3 % and mixed fertilization (soil and foliar) and to determine the influence of manganese and fertilization upon the nutritious value of fruit of marrows. Author should focus the main objective i.e. the nutritious value of fruit of marrows which did not seem to be described properly in the whole manuscript. The English of the authors is very poor. An abstract is basically a short summary of a complete research. In present work it is not done well, there raised major queries i.e. what did actually author do to get? What are the larger implications of the findings? What is the empirical formula of BTC? In introduction Literature review not adequate. Old citations are used. In material and method experimental design is not described. Author used commercial products for the purpose of the experiment that are complete foliar fertilizers i.e. Fitona (7.2:0:5.2+M.E.), Hortigrow (20:20:20+M.E. +A.A) and Humustim (on base of potassium humates-3:1.14:7.83+M.E.), the values are given in brackets with some abbreviation is not understanding for the readers. It is obscure why the commercial products were selected for foliar spray? How much NPK and commercial products are applied to the soil/foliar spray? How did author prepare the water solution for foliar fertilizer? What will be its ECiw? Author should measure ECe of the soil.	Thank you for the recommendation. For the purpose of the experiment complete foliar fertilizers. Fitona (7.20%N. 5.20%K₂O, 1.5%Ca 0.9%Mg. 0.1%Fe. 0.1%B, Cu, Zn, Mn, Mo. Fitotech Ltd., Bulgaria) Hortigrow (20%N 20%P₂O₅ 20%K₂O, 0.06%Fe, 0.02%Zn, 0.01%Mn, 0.01%Cu, 0.02%B, 0.001%Mo and 1% amino acids, Hortiland Ltd., Nederland) and Humustim (on base of potassium humates-3%N, 1.14%P₂O₅, 7.83%K₂O, 3.92%Ca, 1.1%Mg, Cu, Zn, Mo, Mn Co, B, S. Agrospeis Ltd., Bulgaria), were used. The ratio of soil fertilization was N₁₆P₁₆K₁₆. Phosphorus and potassium fertilizers were applied with last tillage of soil before planting. Nitrogen fertilizer was applied twice during the growing season. First application was after formation of new leaves of plants, and the second - 20 days after the first. Indices: N₁₆ – introduced as NH₄NO₃ (34 % N) ; P₁₆ – introduced as Ca(H₂PO₄)₂ (46 % P₂O₅); K₁₆ – introduced as K₂SO₄ (50 % K₂O). Water solution of foliar fertilizers was prepared. Foliar fertilizers are brought in the given concentrations three times in the phases- beginning of flowering, beginning of fruit production, mass fruit production. Solution with the needed



SDI Review Form 1.6

	The author wrote ‘thirty days seedlings were grown in an unheated plastic greenhouse (what was the condition of plant at this moment it was not described?) No data is presented for the growth. The authors should present the growth data of the plants. Which part of the plant material is used for the determination of manganese? And at what time it was collected? Statistical analysis is missing. Statistical significance was not shown in Tables. The discussion is not constructive and critical but simple descriptive, and the bibliography citations in the text are often reported without comment, even when providing contradictory results on the same kind of study. Conclusion is not written properly.	concentration is prepared for the different variants. Control plants are treated with pure water. The consumption of working solution in the first spraying is 60 l.da^{-1}, and in the second and third 80 l.da^{-1}. Plants are cultivated according to the conventional technology for early field production of marrows, as previously produced seedlings is used (Cholakov, 2009). The seedling is on thirty days, cultivated in non-heated polythene hothouse. Plants are planted on bed-furrow surface, according to scheme $100+60/50 \text{ cm}$ and density of plantation 2500 number of plants per da in beginning the May. Growth period is 45 days after planting. Total carbohydrates were determined by Haygedorn – Jensen (Stanchev et al, 1968) and dray mass-weight method (Stanchev et al, 1968). Materials were collected in mass fruit production The manuscript was revised thoroughly to correct the problems.
--	---	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		