



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 <i>(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)</i>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	The paper is written in an English language below the standard usually seen in scientific papers. It cannot be published without some improvement in the quality of the English language. The authors should look for some local help for English revision or alternatively I recommend that authors seek the services of an international company of English revision (American Journal Experts, for instance). The paper reports only one year of results. Discussion and Conclusions should take this into account. The authors must know that olive tree presents a pronounced alternate bearing habit which reduces the meaning of the results obtained in a single year. The trees usually do not respond fast to the applied fertilizers. The authors should look to their results as very preliminary. In their experimental designs, the authors applied similar nitrogen rates to trees planted at very different spacing. Thus, the nitrogen rates applied per hectare were particularly different. In their work (material and methods section) they should clarify what nitrogen rates were applied per tree	I agree with you, these are preliminary results which will be confirmed later. But, we can consider that different sites mean different climatic years or different repetitions.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	and per hectare. This fact should also be taken into account in Discussion section. The tables and figures are really ugly. Authors should take attention to papers previously published in scientific journals and see how to format tables and figures. I put several notes directly in the manuscript, but these corrections are not enough for the paper be ready for publication. The authors should correct the major gaps and resubmit their article.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		