



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_47516
Title of the Manuscript:	Growth and instability of chemical fertilizers consumption in different divisions of Karnataka (India)
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>In the abstract, hint briefly at the positive and negative implications of fertilizer use and why analysis of growth is important</p> <p>Describe consequences of overuse of fertilizer e g near line 61 where optimum use is addressed and comment on whether this is a problem or not in India and Karnataka</p> <p>In the Methods section, describe how the CV was derived (between years?? between subdivisions??)</p> <p>The growth rate in the formula is fractional, that in the Results is most likely per cent – explain this in the table heading; what is the unit of the CV?</p> <p>It would be interesting to have an example diagram e.g. illustrating the 300-fold increase with time in N period I Bengaluru and subsequent levelling off– is this really reflecting reality or is it a statistical artefact reflecting initially poor statistics? The reliability of the statistics from the Directorate should be discussed. Can it be corroborated with data from sales companies, interviews with farmers, reliable information from neighbouring states or the like?</p> <p>Examples of absolute numbers for the amount of fertilizer per unit area should be given; this could be compared with other data and add credibility to the statistics https://www.geographyandyou.com/agriculture/crops/fertiliser-consumption-state-wise-pattern/</p> <p>Overall the reliability of the statistical data should be critically discussed</p>	All corrections have been done
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Avoid abbreviations in the abstract (CAGR, period I-III) or explain them at first use (NPK) Capitalise country and other names (China, Maratha)</p> <p>Explain the categories of fertilizer line 55 DAP, NPK, MOP</p> <p>Explain abbreviations first time they are used, e.g. line 57 NBS</p> <p>The English language is generally good but a review is warranted, e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “was consider for” ; • line 36 “is currently the second” should refer to India • line 85 “because to know” • definite and indefinite articles “the” and “a” are missing in many places <p>Avoid using 5 significant figures e g 112.24 % when at best only the first three are significant</p>	All corrections have been done
Optional/General comments	The statistics is not credible and more effort should be spent on discussing sources of error in the data	



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2:

	<u>Reviewer's comment</u>	<u>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>
<u>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</u>	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>
