



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

	and actinomycetes. None of these methods have been described in methodology. Tables of the results quantify the total percentage of microorganisms and the percentages of some groups are presented. But in the discussion the authors present CFU values for the different groups. These values should be on the table for the reader's knowledge. I suggest separate tables: one with all these values were quantified in different seasons and depths, including the total number and another with the percentage of interest groups. I suggest more discussion of all columns and rows, comparing populations, the seasons and depths, highlighting differences and similarities. In Table1, Scheme II has two potato cultivars and two beans. Why are these measurements separated if the values are very similar? Quantification by plate count. I'd like to remember, however, that without showing statistical deviations of these measurements some differences are negligible when using the plate count methodology. The authors present a discussion from line 248 that I do not consider relevant. This discussion attempts to justify the coefficient of mineralization of soil microbial activity as a function of bacteria that	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	utilizing mineral or organic nitrogen. The authors do not present the methodology to quantify the coefficient of mineralization, nor show results of quantification of bacteria that utilizing organic and mineral nitrogen. Sounless that information included in the body of the text, the discussion does not have reliability. The conclusions, from line268, for the same reason mentioned above, may not be included. I recommend that the authors to include the statistical deviations of the results obtained, modified the tables with all the data, alter the methodology, including everything that was quantified and revise the discussion and conclusions based on what was done. .	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Note: Modification was done in this document ONLY to hide some comments, which are against the SDI peer review guidelines.