



SDI Review Form 1.6

SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>American Journal of Experimental Agriculture</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEA_24638
Title of the Manuscript:	Efficacy of sweet orange and cassava peels amendments for the management of root-knot nematodes of tomato
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>)



	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	The study “Efficacy of sweet orange and cassava peels amendments for the management of root-knot nematodes of tomato” attempts to devise best bet options for managing nematode effect on crops. The authors have tried to devise alternative sustainable solutions that respond to the needs of small-scale farmers. The subject is very relevant for the scientific audience and the agricultural community as it addresses an issue with high importance in many crops. The methodology is simple but effective for the intended purpose. However, the presentation format does not meet scientific standard and should not be published in the current state. However, if the authors can pay attention of the corrections and improve the quality of data and presentation, then the paper would be good for publication.	



SDI Review Form 1.6

SDI Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments

Optional/General comments

Line 24: “For the field experiment, all the amended plots”, amended with what?

Line 59: “demonstrated in a large number of studies (4)”. Just one cited is not logical when you say that it has been demonstrated in a large number of studies – add more citations

Lines 72 - 74: There should be supporting hypotheses for this objective.

Line 76: Heading numbering order – 1.1: Introduction is 1, Materials and methods is supposed to be 2, results and discussion is 3, etc.

Line 306: Results – Like the previous sections, there is incompatibility in the numbering order

Line 306: This should simply be: 3. Results and Discussion

Line 307: This should be 3.1. Laboratory



SDI Review Form 1.6

SDI Review Form 1.6

	experiment, Then 3.1.1. Percentage eggs hatched at 3, 6 and 9 days after inoculation in different aqueous extracts in vitro Line 308 - 318: You frequently describe the effect on your data as “lowest” or “highest”, Is this statistically significant, if so, give the P value (i.e. $P < 0.05$ or $P < 0.01$ or $P < 0.001$, etc.) Lines 320: The table format is poor, please edit. Also include the Tukey’s significant differences denoted by letters (i.e. a, b, c, etc.). Line 337: 3.1.2. Percentage mortality of root-knot nematode juveniles in the different aqueous extracts in vitro Line 348: See comment above regarding table 1 Line 352 - 368: Authors did not provide comprehensive discussion of the results and conclusion relevant to their findings. Needs to be upgraded with relevant supporting references. Line 370: 3.2. Field experiment Line 371: 3.2.1. Effect of organic amendments on	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

SDI Review Form 1.6

	the yield of tomato in the major and minor seasons Lines 372 - 374: This heading seems to be irrelevant here, and there is no supporting data for this Line 387: Table 3. You can remove the one decimal point for the data because it is zero, except for the statistical data for Lsd and CV %. Are these data significantly different, then include the Tukey's (see previous comments on tables). Otherwise, the table does not present the importance in the current format. Lines 387 - 409: Are you comparing seasonal variations or the effects of the organic amendments within seasons? You may need to revise this to reflect your main objectives and hypotheses Line 410: Table 4, not clear and does not convey specific information, consider revising. See previous comments on tables. Lines 416 - 426: Discussion is inadequate and inadequate supporting references.	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

SDI Review Form 1.6

Lines 416 - 500: These do not support the objective in lines 72-74, seem you have to manage the volume of data and present it coherently for better understanding. The tables are also difficult to understand and looks irrelevant especially given that they are many – 6. I think you should concentrate on the main result with statistical significance and improve on the presentation style and format, so as to enhance the understanding of the audience. Also present logical discussions on the results. The fact that your objective is limited and there is no hypothesis does not help to define your presentation, and would be good to redefine your objects according to the results presented and consider some hypotheses in the introduction.

Lines 502 - 521: The conclusion is an extension of the discussion and therefore lacking for this section of the paper.

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Ngosong Christopher</i>
Department, University & Country	Department of Agronomic and Applied Molecular Sciences, Faculty of Agriculture and Veterinary Medicine, University of Buea, Buea, Cameroon