



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>Journal of Agriculture and Ecology Research International</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAERI_22741
Title of the Manuscript:	Effects of Lime on Growth and Yield of <i>Mucuna flagellipes</i> (Vogel ex hook) in an Acid Tropical Ultisol
Type of the Article	Original research Articles

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	Line 9: The effects of CaCaO3..... (Rewrite as this The effects of lime (CaCO₃).... Lime should be written CaCO₃) Line 48: It should be written as Calcium carbonate (CaCO₃)..... Not as Calcium bicarbonate (CaCO₃). Line 97: Mature health seeds..... It should be written as Mature healthy seeds..... Briefly describe utisols under the site description. Line 167: Relative humidity and air temperature are different. Please, state relative humidity of the experimental site. Use standard SI units for Total N and organic matter content. For example N (gkg⁻¹) Line 177: Table 3 shows not showed (correct all grammatical error in the text). Line 188, line 210: did not produced obvious (grammatical error). It should be did not produce Line 215: The result in Table 7 revealed (Grammatical error). It should be written as The result in Table 7 reveals Line 216 DAPS???? What is the meaning? There are lots of grammatical errors in result section of this manuscript. The result must be presented systematically with subheading. Line 239: This support the findings of [5] who reported increase in soil pH with the application of 2.0 tha⁻¹ of CaCO₃. Your result (4.0 t/ha) is different from researcher that got 2.0 t/ha. Therefore, word 'support'	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	should be removed and rewrite the sentence. Line 250; source of nutriate (spelling). Rewrite There are lots of grammatical errors in Discussion section. Rewrite this section. Could you please relate your result into source-sink of photosynthate, from low response of treatment in vegetative stage to high response of treatment during reproductive stage?	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Ade Onanuga</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Biology, Dalhousie University, Halifax, Canada</i>