



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	MS: 2012/AJEA/2102
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECT OF NPK FERTILIZER ON FRUIT DEVELOPMENT OF PUMPKIN (<i>Cucurbita pepo</i> Linn.).

General guideline: Reviewers are requested to follow these guidelines during review: *(Note: Title of different sections as proposed below may differ in case of review paper / case reports)*

- Introduction *(Is the problem/objective of this study original, important and well defined?)*
- Materials & methods *(Kindly comment on the suitability of the methods. Sufficient details of the methods should be provided to allow peers to evaluate and/or replicate the work)*
- Results & discussion *(Kindly comment on: 1. Are the data well controlled and robust? 2. Authors should provide relevant references during discussion. 3. Discussion and conclusions should be based on actual facts and figures. Biased claims should be pointed out. 4. Are statistical analyses must for this paper? If yes, have sufficient and appropriate statistical analyses been carried out?)*
- Conclusion *(Is the conclusion supported by the data, discussed inside the manuscript? Conclusions should not be biased and should be based on the data, presented inside the manuscript only)*
- Are all the references cited relevant, adequate? Are there any other suitable current references authors need to cite?
- 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 and write here 'Corrected'/ if not agreed, give suitable justifications)
<u>COMPULSORY REVISION</u> comments	All figures are adapted quadratic regression curves; I think there is no reason to introduce this equation. Especially, on Fig6, it is artificial to have a minimum value at 8days after fruits formation and a maximum value at 25days after fruits formation. This paper's results are not enough to publish. Contents are not enough. It should be more emphasized what new findings are, what the originality of this experiment is. This paper focused on fertilizer application, so they should be mentioned the how to fertilized more in details. Almost same figures are very redundant. 7,14 and 28day are same tendency, as well as tables should be more concise. The result NPK fertilizer supply did not significantly increase the rate of fruits growth or the fruits size, I agree the results, further experiments are necessary and further discussion is necessary for example leaching of the nutrients and the recovery rate of fertilizer. If the split fertilization and localized fertilization is adapted, these results might be change. I think these experiments will be more important.	Corrected. Regression equation is necessary here to show the degree of variation as a result of fertilizer application or season. The former figure 6 is now Figure 7. It has been redrawn. Reason for additional fertilizer not having significant effect on the fruit growth and size has been discussed.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		Revised
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		Thanks for the thorough review