



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2013_AJEA_8719
Title of the Manuscript:	Nitrogen Olive Fertilization under Rainfed Mediterranean Conditions
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	Questions: 1. At site 2 there are too much effect according to N dose. Why. 2. At the site 3 the oil content was very high and acidity was also very high. Why. The line 23 the data of cultivated area is since 1999, please to check other reference. Please to check the rules of the Journal for reference there are some errors Other comments are described in the manuscript	1. Indeed, in S2, there is a significant effect of N dose, may be due to the age of the orchard which is older, so, olive trees need more nitrogen. 2. I think this is due to olive variety used by the farmer in this site. Spanish variety (Arbequina) is known by a higher acidity compared to the Moroccan Picholine which is used by farmers in S1 and S2.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The order the reference is wrong . Should be according to text, no alphabetical Check manuscript	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Check manuscript	