



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Journal of Plant &amp; Soil Science</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_57010
Title of the Manuscript:	Compost derived from sugar cane processing waste better improves <i>Baillonella toxisperma</i> P. growth in Nkoteng-Cameroon locality
Type of the Article	Original Research 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>)

**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>The manuscript has good potential and is of interest to the area to which it applies. However, before being accepted for publication, some corrections are necessary. The abstract has some flaws, in general, in relation to scientific writing such as giving objectives to the manuscript instead of taking it for itself. Authors should not be afraid to use the first conjugation "I", "we" when writing. The keywords are problematic: most repeat those words in the title. Please choose words that identify your study, its main results and conclusions.</p> <p>Although the discussion is mostly elegantly constructed, some points are uncomfortable: there are several sentences just showing results from other studies; what the authors need to do is to conclude based on the results presented by these studies and to increase their conclusions based on their results. In addition, there is an entire topic of description of results without proper discussion.</p> <p>Finally, the Conclusion does not serve its purpose here. I left a suggestion in the PDF file that can help the authors build their conclusion.</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	Captions need to be more complete and lead readers to identify exactly what is needed in the tables and figures. They must be conclusive.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Joan Bruno Silva</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>State University of Paraíba, Brazil</b>