



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2013_AJEA_7082
Title of the Manuscript:	Effects of the Foam of Sugarcane (Sacharum officinarum L.) and Inorganic Fertilizer on the Chemical Characteristics of a Tropical Cambisol
Type of the Article	Original 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	The manuscript has scientific relevance and applicability in its field. The introduction is grounded and explains clearly the importance of the study. The aim contained in the abstract should be modified because it is not clear how the end of the introduction. Materials and Methods provided sufficient details to enable other researchers are able to reproduce the experiments described. Results are presented clearly, with tables and figures for easy understanding. The statistical analysis was superficial, not being shown in the tables the averages and standard deviations values. The conclusion is not consistent with the objective (Investigate of different rates of foam on the Cambisol of sugarcane affected by long-term cultivation in Zuenoula area under inorganic fertilizer-NPK management). This conclusion may remain, but as a final consideration (in the end of the conclusion).	Thanks Changes are done Thanks Thanks Normally, ANOVA procedure included such of aspect when defining difference between data. However, we have added the standard deviation as suggested. Done



SDI Review Form 1.6

	All the references cited relevant and adequate	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Authors should adjust the resume objective, add the values of the standard deviations of the data in the tables and make adjustments in the conclusion	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		