



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Applied Life Sciences International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JALSI_48748
Title of the Manuscript:	Nitrogen Doses And Humic Substances In Custard Apple Nutrition
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>)

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 experiments in this manuscript were conducted and reported properly but there were some inconsistencies. The soil pH in Table 1 showed a pH of ~7 whereas the soil pH with no added N in Figure 2 showed a pH of 5.5. This is a 1.5-point variation. Though there were no significant effects of humic substances, except K, the variation in these data would make the detection of differences very difficult. If the fact that humic substances had no effect is relevant the author(s) should do power functions to determine what differences could have been detected given the level of variation in the data. The statistic only works one way, because you didn't find a difference doesn't mean there wasn't a meaningful difference. There are almost no results to report in this manuscript and no significant agronomic or horticultural result to report.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Dale Loussaert
Department, University & Country	USA