



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2013_AJEA_3536
Title of the Manuscript:	The effect of macro and micronutrient fertilizers on the growth and yield of rice under calcareous soils

General guideline for Peer Review process is available in this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

- This form has total 9 parts. Kindly note that you should use all the parts of this review form.



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2: 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	1. Except for the plant heights, all data are obtained at harvest. So why keeping 'growth' in title? Title may go as 'Effect of macro- and micro-nutrient fertilizers on yield and yield attributes of rice in a calcareous soil' 2. Authors need to update the MS with recent references. Most of the literatures cited date back year 2000 and before, and the latest one is 2004. 3. The need for balanced fertilizer application is well-documented. In introductory part, authors stressed mostly on global aspects, but are silent on the national/regional problems. The problem need not be reiterated, rather authors should concentrate on the study area, and the consequence of using/not using micronutrients with special reference to Iran. 4. the statistical analysis should be clearly mentioned. Excel is not a statistical software as such, even though it can be used for some basic statistical interpretation. How split-split-plot design was analysed using Excel? 5. Aim of study (line 45) was 'decrease in soil pH'? How this can be aim of a study? Where was vegetative growth studied? Even though pH was measured 5 times, where is pH data? 6. There should have been correlation study on effect of pH on yield and yield attributes. Mean soil pH is OK, but the temporal changes need to be stated. Was there any trend in decrease in pH? Has it got stable after a period? 7. Authors need to analyse more methodically, the decrements of pH under the fertilizers, and the yield increase over control. It appears as just a report and need to be upgraded to a scientific article for a wider audience. 8. An economic analysis should be supplemented, as application of micronutrient fertilizer often comes with a cost. Hence, the relative yield increase must compensate the cost incurred in providing the balanced nutrients over the mono-fertilizer application. 9. The discussion part is either poor and absent on many aspects. While authors explained results, they fail to support their findings with appropriate discussion. There	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	is also lack of relevant references, especially the recent literatures. 10. The first sentence of conclusion is a general statement. Even though it was supported by the data in the MS, avoid repeating results in conclusion. Also provide some suggestions on the future aspects or suggest some studies to be taken up in future.	
Minor REVISION comments	1. What is 'adequate Ca²⁺ available in' (line 103)? 2. Line 113: Give quantitative information. 3. line 111: What is 'this' and 'experimental' soils? 4. table 1: use SI units uniformly. 5. Provide clear information on the NPK and other nutrient doses, and the % of these available in fertilizers used. 6. better to show a field layout of the expt. 7. Line 170-71: where is pH data? What is 'total' mean pH? Table 3 8. Pl keep uniformity in decimal places between tables 1 and 2. Table 2 has the most realistic values, while the ANOVA in table 1 has so many decimal values, which seems irrelevant. 9. Which version of MS Excel was used? 10. Reduce Introduction. Make it more relevant to the current study, rather than a wider relevance to food security and malnutrition etc.. 10. Line 70: What does it mean, ;more than half of arable soils...? 11. Pl. Modify line 99-101. Make this more close to the objective of the study. 12. In materials/meth, detailed account of treatments are necessary. Authors can add a suitable diagram for the expt lay-out. 13. Why plant height was given importance? No scientific explanation is given? Why it was taken twice? Is there any significant difference, and does it carry any significance?	
Optional/General comments	Overall, the study adds to our existing knowledge to confirm the beneficial effect of micronutrients addition to rice. However, the article lacks mostly in its scientific presentation of data and the discussion as followed. There are queries pertaining to the statistical analysis, and the use of MS Excel (which version? Not clear) as the statistical software for split-split plot analysis. A thorough English language revision is a must, as the MS contains ambiguous and bad use of sentences/phrases.	

Note: Anonymous Reviewer