



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2013_AJEA_7110
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECT OF PHOSPHORUS AND RHIZOBIA INOCULATION ON GROWTH AND YIELD OF SOYBEAN (Glycine max L. Merrill)
Type of the Article	Research paper

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 present study reports the results of a 1 year field study on the effects of phosphorus and rhizobia inoculation on growth and yield of soybean. A perusal of literature reveals such evaluation studies are yet to appear. The manuscript is well organized. A chapter "Introduction" is too generally. Shows the need for food production but there is nothing about the needing of phosphorus and rhizobia inoculation treatment. I think it requires a thorough redrafting. Author are using :significantly or not significantly etc. adding "P>0.05" It is not necessary to add the level of significantly in the text but it is necessary to show the level of significantly under the table – only. Author sometimes use the level of significantly P<0.05 and other hand P>0.05. I think it is mistake and the true is: P<0.05 (for using only under table or Methods chapter) I can't find the method of statistical analysis of results – it is necessary Regarding the location of the experiment (Methods) would be better to specify the geographic location References: - Some of references have no number of issue (R. 355, 359, 373, 388, 399) or number of pages.	The research was indeed conducted in the major and minor cropping seasons of 2012 and repeated in 2013. It was unfortunate that the manuscript presented reported only one year. The 'Introduction' section has been redrafted to include the need for Phosphorus and rhizobia inoculation treatment. All sections containing "P > 0.05" have been edited accordingly. Non-significance, NS, P > 0.05, or otherwise have been shown under the tables. The Method(s) used for the analysis of the results have been provided in the manuscript as proposed. The location of the experiment has been duly provided in the manuscript. All corrections concerning references have



SDI Review Form 1.6

	I can't find some (10) of references in the text: R. 359 -Allen 1981 R.361- Brewin 2002 R. 363 Brewin 1991 R. 368 Cassman 1981 R. 370 – Catalano 2007 R. 373 – Eaglesham 1989 R. 375- Fournier 2008 R. 381 – Millenium 2010 R. 385 – Nti 1998 R. 399 – Sanginga 2009 - In the text (R. 82) Hardarson et al. 1987 but list of references has shown (R. 378) Hardarson et all 1989 - In the text (R. 174) is Othman 1991 going alone but in the list of references is (R. 396) OthmanWan et all 1991. I suppose that is mistake. - R. 408 - Weaver is going with letter "1974b" - it is not necessary - one Weaver is in the list	been made accordingly.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		