Editorial comments:

The answers are not logical.
If you have two experiments for two years you should be check differences between the years. If differences will not be you can combine data. The conclusions will be stronger.

I suggested 10 plants (for the future) instead 3 plants, and Authors changed on 3. In the end how many plants were taken for tests.
In Word the is option *Track changes* , why did you not use this for improve the document. You can easily make and view tracked changes and comments while you work in a document and straight fill changes in my document. I can see easily what was changed. You make still a lot of mistakes. May be it is not my job, but I would like to improve your paper.
For example: Arachis hypogaea L. the Arachis hypogaea should be written italic, but L. should be written as a normal character.
The standard US spelling is sulfur. Sulphur is the traditional British spelling. However, the -f- spelling is now standard in scientific and technical writing in the UK, and is increasingly used in other contexts as well, but in one document should be the same spelling.
References are still chaotic.

Since in terms of substance no errors, I accept the manuscript 2014_AJEA_11027 title: *Effect of Jatropha Seed Cake (JSC) and Different Inorganic Fertilizers on Growth and Yield of Two Groundnut Cultivars Under Three Harvesting Time*

Author's feedback:

1-I select 10 plants randomly

2-i did track changes for 3 versions

3- I correct the Latin name

4- I correct word sufur

5- I have done my best to correct the references