SCIENCEDOMAIN international





SDI Review Form 1.6

| Journal Name: | International Journal of Plant & Soil Science |
|--------------------------|---|
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_IJPSS_24271 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | The Effects of Organic Acid Application in Soil on Extractable P and Eggplant (Solanum melongena) Yield |
| Type of the Article | Original Research Article |

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that \underline{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)

SCIENCEDOMAIN international

www.sciencedomain.org



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 Minor REVISION comments | Line 52: OA can be released Don't use abbreviation to start a sentence or paragraph. Line 83 -84: In order to test effects on yield eggplant was used as a signal crop and a fruit yield was measured to determine Rewrite this sentence like this: Eggplant was used as a model crop to test effects of OA applications compared to conventional fertilizer on eggplant yield. Line 100: Prior to treatment, soils were analyzed several parameters. Rewrite this sentence like this: Prior to treatment, soils were analyzed for several parameters Line 100 – 104: Supposed to be in Result and Discussion section not under materials and methods. Lots of mix-up in the materials and methods section. Rewrite this section, make it concise, coherence and understandable. In Results and Discussion section, authors did not support their findings with other related references from other researchers. This is not the way to write conclusion section. Conclusion is too lengthy. Make your conclusion concise and understandable. This manuscript needs thorough revision. | |
| Optional/General comments | | |

Reviewer Details:

| Name: | Ade Onanuga |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Department, University & Country | Biology. Dalhousie University, Halifax, Canada |