SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**International Journal of Plant & Soil Science**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_IJPSS_53537**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Mineralization and decomposition of four types of compost based on biomass of Sida cordifolia L. in a sandy soil in the semi-arid zone of Niger**
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	**1) The topics covered in the article are innovative.** **2) But the English used in not easy to read.** **3) The introduction doen't present the problem very well. By the way there are many studies in the sub region which can be consulted.** **4) The materiel and method section is not clear in general, there are some pictures with French annotations.** **5) The carbon and nitrogen analysis method are old and not longer reliable. And the mineralization method was not explain clearly.** **6) The name of the plant must be write in italique in all the text.** **7) Figure 2 must be in the materiel and method section not in the results.** **8) The statistical method part already explains the results** **9) With n = 4, I am surprised with the SE so low, which means that we cannot differentiate the types of composts.** **10) The results presented as such do not allow an appreciation of the work. There are far too many mistakes in the text.** **11) The discussion should be approached on case-by-case basis as for the results. Moreover there is not enough comparison with other similar works. It is not well written.** **12) A part of the conclusion should be in the discussion/ therefore the conclusion is insufficient**	Thank you for your comments Corrected Done The manuscript has been thoroughly modified and revised.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

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?	***(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)***	