



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Plant Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_APRJ_50718
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Nitrogen and Phosphorus on the Growth and Seed Yield of Spinach
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>)



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>Review comments on “Effect of Nitrogen and Phosphorus on the Growth and Seed Yield of Spinach”</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. On the abstract give the acronym of BCR. It's proper you give the full meaning then acronym.2. Generally the abstract does not give the message of the title “Effects of N and P on Growth and Yield of Spinach”. The growth aspect is not reflected on the abstract. Only the germination percentage, EC values and Yield. The BCR value is given on the abstract but is lacking in the results and discussion section. Include the growth aspects since they are reflected in the results or maybe you scrub them from the results section, this will probably need you to change the title of the manuscript. When the reader scans through the abstracts he/she knows what the content of the paper is all about.3. Please include citation for lines 19-20 and 21.4. Line 21; further benefits of spinach leaves consumption can be of more value e.g vital mineral elements in spinach compared to other vegetables e.g iron which is very good for women5. On the materials and methods section the author has tried to give good explanation however need of some clarification- what treatment was applied on separate N₀ and separate P₀ since combined N₀P₀ was treated with cow dung manure?6. Economic analysis cleared described but the results on this very aspect is lacking.7. Statistical Analysis- this is okay however you can go further to denote letters to easily show significant differences within the treatments. This makes it easy for the reader. For instance in ref no 14.8. Results and Discussion- This section is very wanting. The given results are good but there lacks discussion, which adds up the meat to the research study. What are the speculations or reason behind the specific observations? for instance N₂P₂ and not N₃P₃ give the best results in a number of aspects - this very interesting but there is no explanation. Why did the combined treatment give better results than separate results? Explanation and probably citation of previous work. it added knowledge to science9. In addition there is the connection between the current work and the previous work of other researchers is greatly limited. What is the science behind the specific observations made?10. As mentioned above the economic benefit analysis results is not given nor explained11. On lines 214-216-the citation does not clearly support the current findings. Please elaborate12. Conclusion is not cleared supported by the results and the discussion section as well as the recommendation.	



SDI Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Munene Rozy
Department, University & Country	Kenyatta University, Kenya