




SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

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

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
The authors have done a good revision, but I am still not satisfied as follows: Major issues: - Regarding the depth of the 1-m interplot spacing, the authors responded 'The depth has been reflected in the text', but did not refer to any line number as they did for other responses. And as a matter of fact, no such information was provided. By requesting for this information, I was only trying to let them see the need to describe the measures they took to ensure that was no overland flow among the treatments. But they failed to see this need in a fertility trial as the one they had conducted. It is clear that the plots were not properly demarcated with bunds. The argument that the sandy texture of the soil precludes overland flow must therefore be supported with reliable references showing that average rainfall intensity exceeds average infiltration rate in the area. - Regarding the strength of the discussion, the authors should realize that that so much work has been done on soil and crop responses to specifically animal droppings (mostly poultry droppings) and NPK fertilizer in Ultisols of southern Nigeria (see attached file). I strongly encourage the authors to give credits to these studies and use them to enhance the discussion of their data, more so as these studies started explaining crop responses to amendments from the soil, unlike the present study which shows no soil data as affected by the amendments to be able to explain the responses of waterleaf. - Regarding the Conclusion, 'This would also partly solve the problem of disposing poultry manure in our environment' can be deleted without any loss of value. First, disposing poultry manure in the study area was not part of the objectives of the study. Second, by this conclusion, the authors want the readership of this Journal to have the false impression that the peasant farmers in southern Nigeria are yet to know the agronomic values of poultry manure and that, consequently, its accumulation is becoming environmental nuisance in the area, but that with its diversion to the fields, the people can now be relieved of this problem. Presently, the true situation is that the demand for poultry manure far exceeds the supply in southern Nigeria, thus pushing up the price. The authors left a more important issue under the Conclusion unattended to. And that is the conclusion that 3.75 t/ha poultry manure combined with 100 kg/ha NPK and 3.75 t/ha poultry manure alone are substitutes, which I earlier called their attention to. It seems the authors were concluding based on what they had in mind before executing the study and not based on their data. Poultry manure combined with 100 kg/ha NPK significantly outyielded every other treatment in both years of the study, and the yield was more than twice the yield under poultry manure alone. Even 2.5 t/ha poultry manure combined with 200 kg/ha NPK produced significantly higher fresh foliage than 3.75 t/ha poultry manure alone. What then was the basis for your Conclusion? - Expressing, for the sake of uniformity, all the soil exchangeable bases (Ca, Mg and K) not in % but in mg/kg (as I suggested earlier) and retaining the same numerical values has exposed the error in the values for all three exchangeable bases. Please	First, I want to commend the Reviewer's efforts in improving the quality of this paper. However, I also make bold to observe that the Reviewer assumes a lot and appears impolite in while stating his/ her views. This, for me, is not good as a Reviewer can put forward a view and observations politely. Nonetheless, here are my responses to his observations: - The depth of the 1-m inter-plot spacing was earlier responded to by the authors in the text except that line number was not referred to (see line 168). - The sources of the literature provided by the Reviewer were indeed useful. I have used them effectively (see lines 302 -309 and 321 -327) and they are also given credit by listing sources in the reference section (see the Reference section 355-523). - The sentence 'This would also partly solve the problem of disposing poultry manure in our environment' has been deleted and also the conclusion has been modified because the Reviewer's observations were correct (see Conclusion section and lines 331 -3 38). Also, the unit for K, Ca and Mg has been reconciled (see lines 155 and 156) There was an oversight error in the unit. The correct unit should have been cmolKg⁻¹. This why the values have not change.



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

seek the assistance of a soil scientist to help you ratify the units. Rather than the mg/kg you started with, you may wish to express the soil exchangeable bases in g/kg or, better still, cmol_c/kg. Minor issues 1. Always write 'Ultisol' not 'ultisol'. 2. Having formatted the Abstract according to this Journal's style, you need to convey appropriate information in the sub-sections 'Study design' and 'Methodology' of the Abstract. 3. It is not clear what you meant by (March, 06 and June, 06 in both years) in both the Abstract and the Materials and Methods. 4. Always state the scientific name of crops the first time you mention them (see lines 73-74 for instance). 5. Once more, I suggest you delete lines 99-100, and start from 'Udoh et al (2005) ...' 6. Line 170: A waterleaf landrace, locally called <i>mmong mmong ikong Uyo</i>, was ... 7. How do you justify the use of only 50 plants out of 14,400 plants (< 0.0035%) as your sampling population? 8. Line 300: ... acidification and increasing the availability ... 9. The penultimate sentence of the Discussion (Also, study by Makinde et al. (2010) the findings this that ...) makes no sense to me.	1. Ultisol has been properly written (see lines 2, 14 and 39). 2. My opinion on this is that there is no appropriate information that I have not conveyed in the 'Study design' and 'Methodology' sub-sections of the Abstract. 3. The date of planting and duration of study have been properly explained in both the Abstract and the Materials and Methods (lines 18-19 and 142 and 143). 4. The scientific names of the crops have been mentioned (see lines 71-74). 5. Former Lines 99-100 have been deleted, and it now starts from 'Udoh et al (2005) see line 101. 6. The word 'locally' has been inserted (see line 170) . 7. The number of plants per plot is representative enough ,particularly considering the nature of the plant and the fact that they were randomly selected. 8. The words 'and increasing' in line 115 and not 300 as you stated have been inserted (see line 108). 9. The sentence in the Discussion 'Also, study by Makinde et al. (2010) the findings this that ...' Have been modified (see lines 318 -321).
--	--