



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Advances in Agricultural Research</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAAR_49116
Title of the Manuscript:	The use of biostimulants in high-density olive growing. Quality and production
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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p><u>Results and Discussion</u></p> <p>I suggest this issue is rewritten, since in the tables 2 and 3 appear the means and their standard errors; however, if analysis of variance was made as it appeared in materials and methods, in these tables should appear one standard error per each indicator studied and the significance of analysis of variance. The letters respond to the results of multiple range test made and it should appear in Materials and Methods. On the other hand, if the data appear in the tables are means <math>\pm</math> standard error or standard deviation, I think there is no significant difference among some treatments, so it should be reviewed carefully. It implies the discussion should be modified too. Also, some indicators which appear in the tables 2 and 3, are not commented in this issue, for example, fruit length, fruit width, endocarp weight and so on. Fruit production per variety is commented in the Results and these data not appear in the tables.</p> <p>If one sample per treatment was analysed for determine the oil quality (tables 4 and 5), the authors should not write that the fatty acids, polyphenols and tocopherols were not significantly affected by the treatments studied.</p> <p>The discussion of the results should be improved, regarding the characteristics or composition of each product applied and its possible role in the production of olive trees.</p>	<p>Thank you very much for your comments.</p> <p>The statistical analysis has been revised taking into account the standard error, establishing significant differences between treatments studied.</p> <p>The data of the tables that have not been commented are included in the set of physical properties of the olives, since in general for the weight and the dimensions the differences between treatments coincide.</p> <p>The comment on differences between treatments regarding the quality of the oils has been corrected, commenting that a chemical characterization of them has been done, obtaining the results that are observed in the tables.</p>
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p><u>Materials and Methods</u></p> <p>Here, in the statistical analysis, it is necessary to include the test used to compare the treatment means. Also, authors wrote that a principal component analysis was performed; however, in Results and Discussion, it was not included, so, I suggest it is eliminated. I think it should be included the composition of seaweed-based biostimulant, since it is well known that there are various types of seaweeds.</p>	<p>Thank you very much for your comments.</p> <p>The principal components analysis has been eliminated as a statistical treatment.</p> <p>Also in table 1, the composition of each of the treatments is discussed, among them the algae extract containing 2.08% Boron and 0.02% Molybdenum, adding that it is the GA142 extract.</p>
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<p>References can be improved with the inclusion of more scientific articles published in the last five years.</p> <p>I think that English grammar and edition should be carefully reviewed.</p>	<p>Thank you very much for your comments.</p> <p>The text has been reviewed by two native translators to be sent again.</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

**PART 2:**

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

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>