



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2014_AJEA_14464
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECT OF COWDUNG, NPK AND THEIR COMBINATIONS ON SOIL PROPERTIES AND PERFORMANCE OF SWEET POTATO (<i>Ipomoea batatas</i> L.) IN SUDAN SAVANNA, NIGERIA
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>)



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	Line 10 should reflect that both locations are in Sudan Savanna ecological zone eg ‘...(Bakalori Irrigation Project) both in Sudan Savanna...’ if Sudan Savanna should be included in the title. Line 11 should read “agro-ecological zone”, ... effect of different application rates Acronyms should be introduced before usage, see cowdung (CD) Line 12, line 13 and 14 see H, M, L, line 85 ANOVA and DNMRT Attempt should be made to indicate the places in question (study area) with the aid of a map. Line 73-77: what informed the amount used, and what is the justification for over or under rate application as stated in the objective of the study? This becomes	Noted Noted Noted Levels of the two fertilizer sources was selected for this research in consideration to crop nutrient requirement, chemical composition of the cow dung used and



SDI Review Form 1.6

	worrisome considering that the researcher in line160 used 16 tonnes of farm manure. What is the justification for the various method of application of cowdung and NPK? What method was used for the combination of both treatment? There should proper introduction of Tables before presentation. This applies to Table 1 to 5. Number of tubers per plant-No. T/plt should be included below Table 5: The reference should be in uniform. Some are indented others are not.	income level of the farmer in the study areas. Cowdung was applied completely at a week before transplanting. While NPK was splited and the second dose was applied at 50 days after transplanting, this was to avoid lost of nutrients in mineral fertilizer especially nitrogen and at 50days sweet potato attain its critical period of nutrients requirement. Noted Noted Noted
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments	Line 18: What is the full meaning of CEC Line19: but was to increase Line 20: ...was determined to be significant (p<0.05) and as the best in yield performance at Line 61: this is a point co-ordinate location, it should be area co-ordinate as in line 65 Line 145: The result indicated. Line 146: remove “the” before locations. Line 147: time frame at which.... Line 155: Which produces various organic Line 189: What is the meaning of 14 WAT. Line 207: The result indicated that treatments had significant effect (p<0.05) Line 208: reomove “the” before locations, consider using the highest, instead of best. Line 209: performance is in the control plots. This is similarly Line 211: tend to Line 212: plant height Line 222: something is missing in line 222 Line 246: the same with line 207 Line 247: the same as line 208 Line 253: insert “and” between NPK and combination.	Noted Noted (missing word “to”) Noted Noted Noted Noted Noted Noted 14 weeks after transplanting. Noted Noted Noted Noted Noted
---------------------------------------	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Line 255:While yield performance of	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The amount of mineral fertilizer used by the researcher could have drastically affected the results. If previous researchers used higher amount, this should be the basis of this research work. The recommendation of the researcher negates safeguarding of the environment or environmental sustainability. Research work like this should promote environmental sustainability.	The basis for treatment selection for this research was mentioned in respond to the earlier comment.