



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2014_AJEA_12126
Title of the Manuscript:	Change of the Microorganisms Quantity in Irrigative Grey-Brown and Grey-Meadow Soils under Vegetable Cultures
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	The manuscript is not prepared according AJEA rules. Authors should carefully read the Authors Guidelines and rewrite the manuscript. Abstract is too long it should be rewritten into shorten and more concise form. The first part of the Abstract is later repeated in the Introduction. Methods section is laconically described. Methodology for soil microorganisms abundance are described without any literature positions. Is it means that applied by Authors methods are their own??? Lack of any information about media content. What does it means routine methods in the statistical analysis??? Each statistical test should be specified. Line 127 – Author wrote about population densities...is it means you measured optical density OD₆₀₀? There is lack of any information about it in Methodology.... In relation to CFU the proper is to use the term: abundance or number....not density. Density is measured spectrophotometrically not by microbial counting. Tables and its captions are not prepared according AJEA rules. Line 148 – change 07.4 into 7.4, 08.2 into 8.2, 07.6 into 7.6. However, determined by Authors % of the total number is not equalled 100%. I checked only three first	Considered remarks of reviewer (full paper - p. 1-10). Considered remarks of reviewer and reduced abstract (p. 1) Considered remarks of reviewer (Abstract -Methodology - p. 1 and 2.3. Method -p. 2) Considered remarks of reviewer Considered remarks of reviewer (Table 1, 2, 3, 4). Tables and its captions prepared according AJEA rules. When rounding figure 0,1% difference turned out. Considered remarks of reviewer. Considered remarks of reviewer. The some of references was updated. Considered remarks of reviewer (references 1-18).



SDI Review Form 1.6

	verses and in the 1=100,1% in the 2 and 3 =99,9%... Discussion is poor and based on references to the local authors. I suggest to improve your discussion and also Introduction part by relation to the other world-wide publications. Authors should try to cite the newest publications from 2012-2014. Wrong style of Reference section! References should be numbered in the order that they appear in the text and citations should be indicated by the reference number in brackets.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	There are lots of language and editorial mistakes in the text of manuscript. I suggest the necessity of English correction by someone fluent in English before publication.	Considered remarks of reviewer