



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	2014_IJPSS_10607
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECT OF BIO FERTILIZERS AND NATURAL MINERALS ON PRODUCTIVITY AND FRUIT QUALITY OF "PICUAL" OLIVE TREES
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	<p>Please use IS units for land area (hectare instead of Fadden).</p> <p>Phrase at line 46-50 (from “Two phase... micronutrients”: it is not understandable and it seems the latter lines are repeating the concept in the initial ones. Please correct.</p> <p>Several lines: the term “refuse” is not correct. Use instead “waste” (e.g. compost from waste material or urban waste, etc.).</p> <p>Lines 85-90: please provide the amount of NPK applied with the different products or the composition of the products (e.g. Compost, Pomace, Feldspar, etc.) . Without knowing these information it is useless to know the kg of products applied.</p> <p>Describe the composition of the biofertilizers (Netropeine + Phosphoreine + Potasseine) because we do not know what are they made of.</p> <p>Line 115: describe where and how you measured the shoot diameter (base, middle top of the shoot, single or double measure)</p> <p>Results and discussion: in all text you consider the control as a treatment similar to the others.</p> <p>Control, I assume not receiving anything more than the basic fertilization (this shall be described</p>	All comments are considered and revised in the manuscript as recommended



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>in the Mat&Met), is the reference to which the other treatments shall be assessed against. After this, you can evaluate the treatments among them, to consider if one or some of them are better than others.</p> <p>vegetative growth: try to summarize and find a possible reason to explain the results and discuss with the findings (not only citing) of the other authors you mention. I believe that they have found something similar, but also different from what you did. Try to develop the discussion.</p> <p>Table 2: be consistent with the way you present the data: always 2 (not 1 or 3) digits for decimals. Correct the title of the table, consistent with the names you use in the text for the different kinds of products used.</p> <p>Flowering and set fruit.: a table does not demonstrate (as you write, line 169) but the data in the table show something.</p> <p>The possible explanations for the changes in flowers characteristics (lines 186-188) is quite weak and made on very different physiological mechanisms that are regulated not only by nutrition. I would be cautious in linking the simple K fertilization with water use efficiency and stomatal behaviour.</p> <p>Yield and fruits characteristics/quality: there is a confusion in the data presented in the table and the description in the text. For example yield in is tab 4 bud mentioned in the text as in tab 5. Fruit</p>	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>quality parameters shall be considered together, not separately for olive sizes and other quality characteristics (pulp and seed raw and calculated ratios).</p> <p>Similarly to the other sections, also for the last two the discussion is lacking. It is fine to find the results in line with those of others, but they should be better characterized and discussed. Even differences from previous results and papers can find a correct and reasonable scientific explanation. Also considering that they are dealing with other species (e.g. grape, citrus etc, that are quite different physiologically and agronomically from olive). Make a more specific discussion for the different treatments.</p> <p>Conclusions are missing</p> <p>Edit the text using the format, interline, font type and size consistently throughout the paper.</p> <p>A very deep correction of the English style is necessary. Some statements are really difficult to understand and can be only interpreted, not being sure what really the authors wanted to tell.</p>	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	<p>The paper present interesting results, but they need to be fully rewritten and discussed considering the comparison with the control and among treatments and also the different possible effects that the diverse products could have on the plant and on the soil and on the plant/soil relationships. Also considering the not consistent results for several parameters during the two years of the trial. A final discussion and conclusion considering as a whole the aspects of growth, yield and quality shall be added. A major revision is thus required.</p>	