



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2015_AJEA_18454
Title of the Manuscript:	RESPONSE OF MAIZE PLANTED AFTER TWO LEGUMES TO FOUR RATES OF PHOSPHATE ROCK
Type of the Article	Review 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 provides important data on the effect of nitrogen supply via legumes and phosphorus supply via phosphate rock dosage on maize growth and yield characteristics. I think that the manuscript is worth publishing. However, I still have several important comments on the manuscript. 1/ The most confusing is an explanation of indication of statistical differences in table legends. It is a generally accepted consensus that the same letter indicates that the data do not reveal a significant difference. Therefore, I do not understand the statement below all tables that "Means followed by the same letter in a column are significantly different (P = 0.05)." I think that in fact, the means followed by the same letter are not significantly different and thus the statement should be changed accordingly, i.e., "Means followed by the same letter in a column are not significantly different (P = 0.05)." 2/ There should be inserted a space between the units such as "kg ha⁻¹", "t ha⁻¹", etc., throughout the whole manuscript. 3/ In the manuscript title as well as throughout the whole manuscript, I would prefer to write "doses of phosphate rock" instead of "rates of phosphate rock",	This was a mistake and has been corrected. It affected all tables because it was copy and paste. Thank you. Corrected. I think 'rate' is more appropriate for this research article than 'dose'.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	i.e., modify the title as follows: "Response to maize planted after two legumes to four doses of phosphate rock" - modify "rates of phosphate rock" to "doses of phosphate rock" throughout the whole manuscript. 4/ I do not understand why the heading is "Review article" - it is an Original research article. 5/ Check the reference on line 96: Should it be "Nelson and Sommers 1996" or "Nelson and Sommers 1990"? Minor comments: Abstract, line 15: Insert a comma before the word "respectively" Introduction, line 24: Delete a comma between "Zea mays" and "L.", i.e., write just "Zea mays L." Line 24: Write "nutrients" in the sentence "adequate supply of nutrients" and insert a comma before the word "particularly" Line 25: Correct the word order as follows: "The quantity of nitrogen required..." Line 27: Write "Its availability" Line 37: Write "..for which addition of P represents the only way..."	I would not mind, if the heading is changed to 'Original research article'. Thank you. Corrected to 1990. Corrected. All corrected.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		