



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2014_AJEA_10400
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECT OF DIFFERENT RATES OF PHOSPHORUS FERTILIZER ON SOYBEAN {GLYCINE MAX (L.) MERRIL} INOCULATED WITH RHIZOBIUM
Type of the Article	

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: 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		
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	Since the work is already published I have decided not to report my line by line comments on the manuscript which I have completed before I discover the work is already published. The authors cannot just change phosphorus fertilizer rate and call it a new finding to be published. They have already published the effect of Rhizobium inoculation and phosphorus fertilization on soybean growth characteristics and yield. Also, a field study should be conducted at least for two seasons to reach a reliable conclusion. A one season field study is not mature for publication. Additionally statistical handling of the data is incorrect for factorial experiment. The authors have already published an identical paper on the topic from research conducted in 2012 in the same experimental site and this paper is nothing more than a duplication of that work (http://www.jebas.org/28022014002001/Lamptey%20et%20al%20JEBAS.pdf, or see reference 27 in the current paper to access the paper online).	The authors do not agree with the reviewer that the work is already published. In scientific research a modification of treatments, either by addition or reduction of treatments constitutes a new or updated study. This is exactly the case of this paper and not a duplication as the reviewer seems to suggest. The authors also do not agree with the reviewer that one year data cannot be published. I think it depends on the kind of work. We humbly think this paper is credible and good, especially where this study was conducted.