



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_36000
Title of the Manuscript:	Strengthening Cocoa Production through Site specific Fertilizer Recommendation in Five local Government Areas of Cross River State, Nigeria
Type of the 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	1. First give full forma and abbreviations in the parantheses then use abbr. Throughout the text. 2. Check the citations in the text. 'in intro Opeke 2005 (4), Wessel 1965 (10) 3. Rewrite conclusions based on your results. 4. Remove fig1, it is unnecessary. 5. What is refetence for eq used to calculate base saturation 6. The references are too old. Are there any recent studies to be us ed for discussion 7. 'in mat&met.in lab. Analyses part the solution of the solution? Change this statement . 8. Clarify the objective-c in the intro 9. Give the info about sampling sites in the introduction part not in mat&method secti on 10. What is GDP? 11. Rearrange the results part, it is difficult to read and understand, you can shorten this part .	1. Yes we have done that. 2. The citations (Opeke 2005 and Wessel 1965) had been corrected appropriately. 3. The conclusion is order but I have done some corrections. 4. Fig 1 is necessary to enable the reader know which part of Nigeria the work carried out 5. The reference has been inserted. 6. The references were a mixture of both old and new works 7. The statement has been corrected. 8. The objective has been adjusted to reflect the work properly. 9. The information about site is best given in the materials and methods section. It is appropriate please. 10. GDP is gross domestic products and has been corrected please. 11. The results and discussion section is alright as it is. The tables were appropriately placed for ease of understanding.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		