



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

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

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
Lots of grammatical problems that is hard to understand in the abstract. Example “was determine” “found to increased”, “NPK(M) was determine”, then the recommended “treatments used as important materials”, how many treatments? what treatment? so vague. Also this has to reflect in the results and discussion. This needs to be revised by a native English speaker at least. Spacing again in line 14, 35, 42, 49 and many more. Line 41 – 44 is so confusing, Needs major revision. What is permanent agriculture? The author did not follow my initial recommendation and query Line 20 of the original draft. I said it was not discussed in the results and discussion yet highlighted in the abstract. When the author answered my questions, he did not incorporate those answers and details in the papers in such a way that is easy to find and read by the readers. I am disappointed on supposedly improvement.	Corrected. See the revised copy. Corrected. Improvement was made in the statement. See the revised copy. Is now corrected. NPK (M) recorded the highest tuber yield instead of general sweet potato performance and it now tally with what is in the results and discussion. See the revised copy.