SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Soil Science and Plant Nutrition
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJSSPN_42912**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Soil Fertility, Tuber Yield and Nutrient Uptake of Manihot esculenta Crantz. Influenced by Organic Fertilizers**
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	**Abstract** - ~~158kcal /100 g~~ 158 kcal /100 g - 0.76%, 79 %: Harmonize how to write the %. Either separate it from the number in the entire document, or paste it to the number throughout the document. - Use different sub-section names (Aims, Study design, Place and Duration of the Study, Methodology, Results and Conclusion), as given in the MS word SDI paper template. - Put keywords alphabetically! - Key words (Organic fertilizers) must be different from those present in the title. You can use a word instead of a compound word or a synonym or another key words. Manuscript should be write in sections (1. Introduction, 2. Material and methods / Experimental details / Methodology, 3. Results and discussion, 4. Conclusion, etc) and subsections. Read author's guideline and MS word SDI paper template. **Introduction** - In the text, citations should be indicated by the reference number in brackets [1]. Example: ~~Simonson, 1999~~ [1], ~~Haby et al., 2011~~ [2], etc. - There are some statements without references in the introduction. - Some references used are old and therefore should be updated. - The objective of the ~~present~~ study was to determine the soil properties before and after fertilized soil and post-harvest soil in a cassava field, ~~and~~ yield and nutritional quality of cassava over various treatments with organic fertilizer in compare with chemical fertilizer. **Materials and methods** - The study area is … 94º 15'E). Where did you open the parenthesis to close it? - ~~Figure 1 Location map of the studied area showing; (a) map of Ayeyarwady Region, (b) map of Kyon Pyaw Township (c) Average Rainfall in Kyone Pyaw Township at 2013~~ **Fig. 1. Location map of the studied area**. *(a) map of Ayeyarwady Region, (b) map of Kyon Pyaw Township (c) Average Rainfall in Kyone Pyaw Township at 2013* Ditto for the rest of figures. - ~~Figure 1, Figure 2~~, etc. Write Fig. 1, Fig. 2, etc. - The provenance (place of obtaining) of plant material used in this study was not mentioned. - The experimental design was a randomized complete block with three treatments. How many blocks did you have? - What was the total area of the field? - What was the size of the experimental unit? - On which basis did you choose the fertilizer doses to apply? - Among … nutritional values: moisture, protein, fat, ash, carbohydrate, fiber and calorie content. What methods / protocols did you use for determining nutrient values? **Results and discussion** - The titles of the figures and tables as well as the first row of tables must be in bold; but not the legends. - **Table 1. Physicochemical property of various fertilizers** (Add the point). Ditto for the rest of tables.	The comments are valuable. The corrections are already done.

	- I suggest that you perform a classification of the averages (means) using the Newman-Keuls or Duncan test in case when following the variance analysis you obtain a P-value less than 0.05. You will therefore be able to use the letters to distinguish significantly different means. You will have, a better reading / understanding of the results. - This work was not discussed. The discussion should provide detailed interpretation of data. This should interpret the significance of the findings of the work. Citations should be given in support of the findings. **Conclusion** This work has no prospects **References** - References must be listed at the end of the manuscript and numbered in the order that they appear in the text. Every reference referred in the text must also present in the reference list and vice versa. In the text, citations should be indicated by the reference number in brackets [3]. - Granstedt in the text (introduction), but Grandstedt in the references. - Walkley and Black (1939) in the text (Materials and methods), but Walkley and Black (1934) in the references. - Barron (2014) is absent in the references. - Prokop (2011) is absent in the text. - References are poorly written. Authors must follow the journal guidelines for writing references. Example: Hilly M, Adams ML, Nelson SC. A study of digit fusion in the mouse embryo. Clin Exp Allergy. 2002;32(4):489-98. Rang HP, Dale MM, Ritter JM, Moore PK. Pharmacology. 5th ed. Edinburgh: Churchill Livingstone; 2003. Beers MH, Porter RS, Jones TV, Kaplan JL, Berkwits M, editors. The Merck manual of diagnosis and therapy. 18th ed. Whitehouse Station (NJ): Merck Research Laboratories; 2006. Glennon RA, Dukat M. Serotonin receptors and drugs affecting serotonergic neurotransmission. In: Williams DA, Lemke TL, editors. Foye's principles of medicinal chemistry. 5th ed. Philadelphia: Lippincott Williams & Wilkins; 2002.	
Minor REVISION comments	This article is not well written. Guidelines for the article presentation of the journal and MS word SDI paper template must be taken into account by the authors. English syntax errors have been detected in the text. Re-reading of the manuscript is recommended.	
Optional/General comments		