



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Agriculture and Ecology Research International
Manuscript Number:	2014_JAERI_14503
Title of the Manuscript:	EVALUATION OF DIFFERENT MANURE SOURCES IN SOIL FERTILITY IMPROVEMENT AND YIELD OF FLUTED PUMPKIN IN AN ULTISOLS OF SOUTHEASTERN NIGERIA
Type of the Article	Research paper

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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	This work has a major gap that cannot be solved at this moment. Authors should have used a better criterion for the comparison of treatments. The authors compare situations where $\sim 200 \text{ kg N ha}^{-1}$ were applied with other where only close to 60 kg N ha^{-1} were applied. Is it fair? Authors should have compared the amendments based on the amount of nutrients (nitrogen) applied or based on the commercial cost (or local valorisation) of the amendments. Thus, the authors should have caution in their statements. Figures: For me it is debatable whether these relationships are useful. If the amendments affected equally CEC and vine length, it is clear to me that it will found a positive linear relationship between these two variables. In my opinion, these figures do not add nothing to work.	Because of huge quantity of organic wastes required for field crop production and its handling problems that usually limits its use to distant farmers, that was why it has become necessary to combine different types of these organic manure and inorganic. This is the gap the authors tried to bridge. The comparison was not based on the nutrient composition of materials used rather on the quantity that famers can easily access or afford that are environmental friendly. The issue considered in the choice of the amendments was on the handling and cost of procurement by local farmers. This issue has been addressed by removing those ones that are not much relevant to the work.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		