SCIENCEDOMAIN *international*
www.sciencedomain.org

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	**The paper shall be revised by an English speaking person because it is very difficult to read and to understand the meaning. Frequently the terminology used is not correct (e.g. line 54 on humus, 57 on P, 71 on treatments (variants), all correlation (subordinate) figures, and others).** **The methods of determination of carbohydrates and of the dry matter as well as the statistical analysis used shall be included in the Materials and Methods.** **One of the fertilizers used in the trial does not contain any manganese (see Table 2). How can be studied its effect on manganese nutrition?** **The data shown in tables and figures do not contain any statistical reference (SD or SEM) nor discrimination according to mean differences. Thus, it is not possible to evaluate the differences between treatments, nor to consider the interpretation made by the authors.** **The correlations between different parameters are made on the basis of three points. In some cases other curves then those shown could be drawn to represent the relationships. Therefore, it is difficult to interpret the results.** **In some cases an unknown unit is used for the data (e.g. kg dka-1). Please use SI units.** **There is inconsistency in interpreting the results. For example compare lines 151-152 and 159-160.** **Some conclusions made in the discussion are trivial: e.g. the statement on lines 171-172. Others are too**	

	speculative: e.g. the statement on lines 182-184. There is no discussion with work of other authors. Even though studies on marrow are limited, literature on the effect of manganese fertilization on plants is quite common. This shall be considered.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Eligio Malusa**
Department, University & Country	**Research Institute of Horticulture, Poland**