



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEA_24630
Title of the Manuscript:	Yield and Yield Attributes of Tomato as Influenced by Organic Fertilizer
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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Please explain about the degrees of freedom? 4 treatments and 3 replications? $12-1 = 11$? Which one was the production? Fertilization of 100 t/ha of organic fertilizer- farmers can afford this fertilizer application? Which one is the base of organic fertilizer, how do they do the organic fertilizer? There were not pests? Illness?	We acknowledge the reviewer's comment, but each replication was an average/mean of 10 plants to minimize the type 1 error when the actual analysis was computed. With the measures in place we felt the three reps were precise enough. We don't understand the reviewer's comment Yes, because organic fertilizers (in the form of manure such as kraal manure e.g. 5-8 kg m⁻²) are recommended for smallholder farmers who normally owe small farms or produce crops in their backyard gardens. It should be noted that this is not purely manure- refer to the process of making this organic fertilizer under methodology The process of making the organic fertilizers is described in 2.2 from line 69 to 74. There was no evidence of pests and illness of plants and fruits in this study
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		