

Editor's Comment:

No. The manuscript describes an experiment and its analysis on a stochastic relationship between fertilization and plant growth but science research is about looking for underlying mechanisms, reasons of studied phenomena. The authors speculate about eventual mechanisms (photosynthesis, cell division, etc.) that they did not evaluate / measured. Even the stochastic relationships obtained are not reliable because they were based in one single year experiment and this kind of work is strongly dependent on environmental conditions that can vary widely annually. This work is more like an agriculture technical experiment but even that it is immature.

Yes

No. Long description on treatments, none on methodology.

Material and Methods are insufficient. Missing: how crop was carried out from planting to harvest; when and how the fertilizations were applied; environmental conditions; soil classification; plant variety should be mentioned (not enough in abstract and Introduction).

No. See comments 1.

No. They are limited to a very short list and even shorter when trying to justify their results.

This is an immature experiment, scientifically too light, it does not merit publication.

No. The author needs an editor to clean up the grammatical issues.

Editor's Details:

Prof. Manuel T. Oliveira
Universidade Trás-os-Montes e Alto Douro (UTAD), Portugal.