



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Soil Science and Plant Nutrition
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJSSPN_53478
Title of the Manuscript:	DEVELOPMENT OF LETTUCE PLANT IN SPRING AND AUTUMN PERIOD, EFFECTS OF LED LIGHTENING ON THE QUANTITY OF MINERAL SUBSTRATES AND LEAF NITRATE
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>The paper analyses the differences between spring and autumn cultivation using different kinds of LED lighting. There seems to be a correct experimental set-up and the results founds are interesting. The major comments that the reviewer suggests are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As a general comment, I suggest that the English language is revised by an expert or native, as there are some expressions that may hinder the interpretation of the paper. • Add photos of the experimental set-up. I got an idea on how it was by reading the methodology, but it wasn't completely clear. • I can't find the country where the experiment is carried out. Is it Turkey? In Line 52 the authors say that "in our country...". I would mention the country in there also, as the reader doesn't mean to remember that across the paper. • In the methodology, I think that section 2.2 about lighting practices should go right after section 2.3. • The first paragraph of section 2.3. Planting, Maintenance and Harvest Operations should be stated in clearer way. Something like: Experiment 1 + Set-up + Experiment 2 + set-up. • Photos are also necessary to help the reader understand how the LED was applied to the plants. Was there a opaque separation between pots to not mix the treatments? • Maybe it could be possible to transform a table in a graph? I feel that Table 5 would improve significantly with a more graphical representation. • Could the author provide somewhere the temperature profile for the two tests? Or maybe just the average. That would be a good contextualization of the case study. • There is a lack of discussion in all subsections included in "Results and Discussion". The text just describes the results. As the paper study the effects of LED lighting, it would be interesting to compare the results found in this study with previous ones, even though they analyse other kinds of crops. • How do the reader know that the plants were correctly irrigated. I'm missing data related to water used. Can the authors include them if available? • Content of section 2.4.1 to 2.4.7 are easily integrated into a single section or even in a table. • If variables like weight, diameter or height were measured for every plant, it could be better to represent the data for every treatment using boxplot, which show quatiles, median, etc. Giving only the average doesn't give you the big picture that the data you gathered is offering. <p>After reading the paper, I think that it reflect more the comparison between spring and autumn than the one between control and LED treatments (which is far more interesting). The results between these should be highlighted.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	-	
Optional/General comments	-	



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

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:	Martí Rufi-Salís
Department, University & Country	Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, Spain