



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2015_AJEA_16122
Title of the Manuscript:	Effects of Polybag size and Seedling age (nursery period) on Field Establishment of Cashew (Anacardium occidentale) Transplants in Northern Ghana.
Type of the Article	Original Research 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		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<p>From the general point of view, the manuscript titled "Effects of Polybag size and Seedling age (nursery period) on Field Establishment of Cashew (<i>Anacardium occidentale</i>) Transplants in Northern Ghana" does not bring any new information. On the other hand, the manuscript is well structured with its objectives well achieved. The discussion is well presented and consistent with the introduction and materials and methods. There are some corrections to be done. These include:</p> <p>(1) There are too many brackets in the title. You need to re-write it. E.g. "Effects of polybag size and seedling age at nursery on field establishment of Cashew (<i>Anacardium occidentale</i>) transplants in Northern Ghana"</p> <p>(2) When the means are not significantly different. Statistically it is written ($P>0.05$), while when the means are significantly difference. It is written ($P<0.05$) or ($P<0.001$). Therefore, you need to replace ($P<0.05$) with ($P>0.05$) wherever the means</p>	<p>Title has been corrected to "Effects of polybag size and seedling age at transplanting on field establishment of Cashew (<i>Anacardium occidentale</i>) in Northern Ghana"</p> <p>Means have corrected as suggested.</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>are not significantly different in the whole manuscript.</p> <p>Abstract</p> <p>(3) The last sentence should read: "It is recommended that polybag..... should be used to"</p> <p>(4) Key words: Do not repeat words in title</p> <p>Materials and Methods</p> <p>(5) "Lsd" should be in capitals "LSD" line 89. Similarly on Figure 1 and in all Tables.</p> <p>Results</p> <p>(6) You need to re-write the results section. Do not present or repeat the figures presented in the tables in the texts. For example line 97 to 104: "The average weight of the larger polybag size 98 (17.5 cm x 25 cm) filled with top soil was 2.6 kg whilst the other polybag sizes weighed 99 between 0.6 kg and 1 kg. Averagely ten (10) of the larger bags (with total weight of 26 kg) 100 could be accommodated in a head pan to be carried per person over the 200 m distance. 101 Whilst the same weight of 26 kg equals 25 to 40 bags of the medium and small size bags for 102 the same distance. Handling of the small bags was quicker than the larger bags. Averagely a 103 person could fill 400 pieces of the larger bags with top soil whilst 800 to 1200 pieces of the 104 smaller bags were filled within the same time."</p> <p>This sentence can be re-written as: "The results shows that handling of smaller bags was quicker than the other size of bags. Average number of bags filled per person increased with a decrease in size of the bag."</p> <p>(7) Title for Table 1: "Table 1. Average number of (a)</p>	<p>The sentence has been corrected accordingly.</p> <p>LSD's have been capitalised.</p> <p>The results section has been re-written as suggested.</p>
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>bags filled (b) seedlings conveyed per person" What is (a) and (b)?????</p> <p>(8) Scientifically it is recommended to present means with their standard errors. Therefore, you need to include standard errors in Tables 1, 2 and 3 as you have done in Table 4.</p> <p>(9) On the note of each table and in the text you have written: **=significant at ($P<0.01$). I believe this should be "$(P<0.001)$". Check and confirm from your statistics analysis results.</p> <p>(10) On Tables 2, 3 and 4. You have written: Lsd ($P<0.05$): Polybag 4.37**. Deleted ($P<0.05$) because it is disturbing (It bring noise), Since on the note of each Table you have written **=significant at ($P<0.01$)</p> <p>(11) Make sure that everything written on the note, under each table is covered in the table. For example: (a) On the note for Table 2 and 3 you have written: *=significant at $P<0.05$, while inside the table there is nothing like * (b) On table 4 you have written: ns=not significant, while inside the table there is nothing like ns</p> <p>Discussion</p> <p>(12) Since you have sub-sections in the results section. You also need to do the same for discussion section.</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>(13) You need to re-write the conclusion. The conclusion should be a summary of the main ideas/results and its application/recommendation.</p>	<p>The (a) and (b) was to differentiate between the two sets of data presented in the table. The table heading has been re-written.</p> <p>$(P<0.01)$ has been replaced with $(P<0.001)$.</p> <p>Corrections done as suggested.</p> <p>Corrections done as suggested.</p> <p>Corrections done as suggested.</p> <p>The discussion section has been re-written to reflect the various sub sections in the results. However, given the format of the journal, sub headings were not given in the discussion.</p> <p>Conclusion is re-written following reviewers suggestions.</p>
--	--	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments		
---	--	--