



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Journal of Plant &amp; Soil Science</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_40788
Title of the Manuscript:	Influence of NPK blended fertilizer application on chlorophyll content and tissue mineral contents of two finger millet varieties grown in acid soils of Kakamega, Western Kenya
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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p><b>Lines 9-10:</b> The abstract should be concise and informative. It should not exceed 300 words in length. It should briefly describe the purpose of the work, techniques and methods used, major findings with important data and conclusions. Different sub-sections, as given below, should be used. No references should be cited in this part.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Aluminium ions is a serious environmental problem Is the aluminium ion the problem or the aluminium toxicity?</li> <li>The experiment ... <u>to determine how the NPK blended fertilizer application affects the physiology of finger millet varieties grown on acidic soils.</u> Repetition! Remove it!</li> <li>The measured parameters were chlorophyll content index using CCM-200 spectrophotometer, (Opti-Sciences Inc., Hudson, USA) from the plant leaves at 50% plot maturity [42].</li> <li>[43] Motsara and Roy procedures were used to determine...</li> <li>Means were separated by Least Significant Difference (LSD) test at 0.05 probability level <del>where significant differences were observed.</del> The means comparison already implies that the P-value is less than 0.05.</li> </ul> <p><b>Lines 11-12:</b> You have 9 Keywords, but you have to put at most eight keywords. Keywords (finger millet, NPK blended) must be different from those present in the title. You can use a word instead of a compound word or a synonym.</p> <p><b>Line 16:</b> In eastern and southern Africa small-scale,</p> <p><b>Lines 20-23:</b> Specify reference(s)</p> <p><b>Line 89:</b> 18 m x 13.1 m</p> <p><b>Lines 111, 119, 125, 130 and 135: (Motsara &amp; Roy, 2008): (Remove the point)</b></p> <p><b>Line 112:</b> 0.5 g of leaf sample were wet digested by di-acid in Kjeldahl flask. Then 0.7 g CuSO<sub>4</sub></p> <p><b>Lines 113 and 114:</b> 30 ml</p> <p><b>Line 115 :</b> 0.1 M</p> <p><b>Line 120:</b> 0.5? of leaf sample were wet digested in a di-acid and volume topped to 100 ml. 5 ml of 100 ml solution</p> <p><b>Line 126:</b> 0.5 g of leaf sample were wet digested in di-acid to 100 ml, 5 ml of...</p> <p><b>Line 131:</b> 0.5g of leaf sample were wet digested by di-acid and topped to 100 ml by water. To 5 ml in 50 ml...</p> <p><b>Lines 136-137:</b> 0.5 g of the leaf sample were wet digested by di-acid and topped to 100 ml by water. 5 ml in 50 ml volumetric flask, 10 ml ...</p> <p><b>Line 148:</b> the Fischer's Protected LSD test <del>where significant differences between treatments were observed.</del></p> <p><b>Lines 161 and 271:</b> <del>Figure 2: Figure 4:</del> <b>Fig. 1. Fig. 2. (in bold)</b> The titles of figures and tables as well as the first row of tables must be in bold.</p> <p><b>Line 171:</b> Let's put the letters above the histograms to differentiate the treatments.</p> <p><b>Line 217:</b> <del>Table 1a.</del> Table 1.</p> <p><b>Line 226:</b> <del>Table 1b.</del> Table 2</p> <p><b>Lines 239:</b> <b>3. 6 Tissue... 3.6 Relation... ???</b></p> <p><b>Line 264:</b> This work has no prospects</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p><b>This article is fairly well written. English syntax errors have been detected in the text. Re-reading of the manuscript is recommended. This manuscript is recommended for minor revision.</b></p>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Temegne Nono Carine</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Yaoundé I, Cameroon</b>