



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	_ Asian Research Journal of Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJA_28461
Title of the Manuscript:	The Impact of Sachet Water Sachets and Plastic Bottle Wastes on Agricultural Land at Ada, Ghana
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://sciencedomain.org/journal/47/editorial-policy>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<p>General comments</p> <p>The manuscript's theme is interesting. However, I have some concerns about the manuscript:</p> <p>1) The structure of the manuscript must be improved in accordance with the conventional structure of a scientific article (introduction, material and methods, results / discussion, conclusions and references). The structure is fragmented, clashing of international standard.</p> <p>2) The objectives of the manuscript are simpletons and the research problem seems very predictable. This makes little exciting manuscript. It is not clear the novelty of the findings. Authors should clarify the reasons for the study. What were the initial hypothesis? What are the implications of the findings?</p> <p>3) The results are presented, but there is no discussion of the data. The authors do not explain the findings, either connect the characteristics of the respondents. There is a very simplistic description of the findings.</p> <p>4) It is necessary to draw up a thorough discussion of the results. Otherwise, the manuscript appears very simple and does not contribute to the advancement of knowledge of the area.</p> <p>I do not recommend 3D figures in graphics. The titles of the figures should be improved. All figures should be self-explanatory. The X and Y axes of the graphics should be named. There are too many numbers in Figure 2 which supercharges the figure.</p> <p>5) The conclusions should be rewritten. There is</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>difference between conclusions and summary of the results. The authors present a summary of the results and not conclusions. Conclusions are more general and require further reflection on the results.</p> <p>Thus, considering these aspects, the paper should prioritize the publication of more original studies and better structured.</p> <p>Authors should clarify whether the study was approved by an ethics committee</p>	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Guilherme Malafaia</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Departamento de Ciências Biológicas, Instituto Federal Goiano, Brazil</i>