



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	Conclusions: Conclusion is too short even though based on data from the study. It is not clear what impact the level of fertilization on the parameters of fruit development and which is optimum level of fertilization. References – Not all authors cited in the text are indicated in references. To be added to references: Line 34 – Robinson et al.,1976 Line 40 – Shukla et al., 1980; Alwan, 1986 Line 42 - Kumar et al., 1995 Line 43 – Nurkoric et al., 2004; Line 44 – Adams, 1986 Line 178 – MacArthur and Wetmore, 1941; Smith, 1950; Nitsch et al, 1960; Line 183 – Modlibowska,1945;Wanscher, 1939; Line 184 – Sinnott,1945 Line 185 – Denne, 1960 Line 222 – Gustafson, 1926	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Material & methods: Line 68 – After parameters to indicate measurement units. To indicate which variety or cultivar is used in the field study.	



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Introduction: The objective of this study is original, important and well defined. Material & methods: There is sufficient details of the methods are for to replicate the work. Result& discussion: The data are well controlled and robust. Authors provide relevant references during discussion. The discussion is based on actual facts and figures. Correctly were used statistical methods. Data are well presented in tables and figures.	
---	--	--

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Dimka Haytova
Department, University & Country	Department of Horticulture, Agricultural University – Plovdiv, Bulgaria