



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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	There are almost no results of statistical significances. In all of the graphs, you state that bars are different, however no statistics are shown. For clarification, all similar graphs should be placed together into one figure and the text concerning the different graphs should be merged. Many explanations could be shortened. Are there 3 or 4 replications? Both have been stated. Is it Ghana or Guinea? Both are stated What do the graphs indicate? mean? median? SE? SD? Elaborate on the anova. what did you test? between weeks? then it is repeated?	The data has been reanalysed and presented with LSD to show statistical significances. The number of replications is three and that has been stated in the text. Graphs are presented separately for each parameter to make it easy to follow the results and discussion. The study was conducted in Ghana but in the Guinea savannah agro-ecological zone and that is clear in the text. The graphs indicate standard errors, so the errors bars were not generated automatically by excel as you seem to suggest. Anova tested different rates of Yaralegume (P) fertilizer application with or without Rhizobium inoculation
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		Sentences have been checked for grammar and consistency.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	The English should be checked. for instance northern vs. Northern Ghana. Line 35: delete , References are stated: according to []. This should be: according to author []. Why are those P concentrations chosen? Your conclusion is very simple. Could higher P applications not result in even higher yield? Especially, is there no possible negative effect? eutrophication? Please elaborate on the design: total number of seeds, ridges, hills, why only 2 measured plants,.. Why measure fresh and dry weight? Figure 4: cm²? Be consequent in the graphs: 2D-3D-values above bars, error lines,.. The economic analysis only repeat the results. discuss the actual economic value	References in the text and the reference section have been stated in accordance to the journals format. P concentrations were chosen based on the results of the previous studies. Materials and methods sections of the manuscript have been comprehensively updated with more elaborations. This is now clear in the text with yellow highlights. Fresh and dry weights were taken to determine the Dry Matter. The economic analysis is now interestingly discussed in the text.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Please check the statistics and group the graphs and text explaining the graphs.	The whole data has now been reanalysed again and presented showing significant differences statistically.