



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2015_AJEA_17590
Title of the Manuscript:	Sustainable production of cabbage using different irrigation levels and fertilizer types affecting some soil chemical characteristics
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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<p>The authors should make refinement of the text, especially including results and discussion section.</p> <p>I am of the opinion that the sustainability part of this study was not fulfilled and therefore the word sustainable need to be removed from the title. Using organic fertilizers for a long time has negative consequences. For example, using organic manure for a long time resulted in the building up of heavy metals that become toxic to our environment. Some of these elements end up in the downstream water and or polluting the underground water. This study did not show anything about this and how can farmers use organic fertilizers in a responsible manner.</p> <p>The abstract is way too long and need to be reduced into half.</p> <p>The characteristics of the study site are needed for example, climatic conditions (rainfall, temperature, evaporation, humidity, wind speed) as well as the agricultural practices and the most commonly grown crops.</p> <p>Statistical test was supposed to be run on Table 4 as well in order to make concrete conclusion.</p>	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments	My recommendation is that the manuscript be sent back to the authors pending addition of information that would make the results and discussion more understandable and of high standard. There should be some attempt to statistical analyse the data especially on Table 4 as it was done on the other tables (i.e. Table 5-8).	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Anonymous
Department, University & Country	Agricultural Research Council, South Africa