



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Botany
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRIB_55063
Title of the Manuscript:	Physio-Chemical Alterations and Early Growth Response in Application of Cow dung and NPK Fertilizer to Irvingia wombolu Seedlings
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>1. Justify the whole document</p> <p>2. Combine organic manure literature to flow logically</p> <p>3. Aim of the study should be frame in a way that it has contribution to early stages of the seedlings. Specific objective should be the practical part of the study and should come out clearly and comprehensive. E.g objective 1. Determine the effect of cow-dung manure and NPK fertilizer on soil particle size on irvingia wombolu nursery seedlings.</p> <p>4. Study area- should give total annual rainfall per year.</p> <p>5. Collection of soil samples- the author should describe soil sampling in action step by step and sample preparation prior to analysis. Sample preparation and analysis should include both physical and chemical analysis</p> <p>6. the author should make methodology section to flow logically like data collection should come before laboratory analysis procedure. Nusery establishment should come before planting and sampling</p> <p>7. results before planting is missing in methodology</p> <p>8. Result should be in one page</p> <p>9. conclusion- trial methodology set-up may not appear but can discuss results the way it is only.</p> <p>10. the author should give ideal fertilizer rate suitable for seedlings plant. I think high rate of combine fertilizer is not recommended as per results</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	Should revise methodology section properly	
Optional/General comments	The paper is worthy doing. For farmers and value addition	

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Rhoda C. Ruto
Department, University & Country	KALRO- Tea Research Institute, India