



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Agriculture and Ecology Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAERI_23382
Title of the Manuscript:	The Impact of Organic Soil Amendments on Population Densities of Plant Parasitic Nematodes and Okra Yield
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 <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	- The statics analyses are not correct. The comments are in the each table, like the distribution of the letters for the data. tables - the authors should look carefully the statics analyses before to include the letters. The letters don't make any sense. Have to look for a statistical helper. References need to be check – they are out of order too. See the rules form the journal.	The issues relating to the tables have been fixed. References section has been re-ordered accordingly.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	In the results, some sentences don't belong to the results those are review. It is market in the text; In the abstract there was no economic study included in the material and methods, so this word should be limited, with no effect on the results.	These concerns have been addressed and highlighted in the text.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	There is much more new review in this subject that could give better support to the authors. The comments about the climate in the results does not make sense in the way they present, but if better explored with good review could have some relationship with the date in the different season.	The part in question has been reworted and highlighted in the manuscript to reflect the content of this work.