



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_32048
Title of the Manuscript:	THE GROWTH AND TUBER YIELD OF CASSAVA AS AFFECTED BY CASSAVA PEEL COMPOST APPLICATION.
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)
	This study is based on an important issue pertaining in agricultural practices of African region. Entire article font should be "Arial" not "Times New Roman". And also the author should follow the guidelines about manuscript preparation (font size etc.). Please correct all formatting errors (line spacing: double, missed spaces between paragraphs, missed spaces between words, missed full stops and commas etc.). "Full stops" of titles in tables should be removed. Five tables should be correctly numbered and formatting options must be similar to all. Reference format should be re-checked.	Done.
	Title	"Full stop" should be removed. Done.
	Abstract	Line 6 – "space" should be removed between cassava and "full stop". Please correct all formatting errors in the abstract. Line 6 – The treatments were prepared in six compost rates as 0, 5, 10, 15, 20 and 25t/ha respectively and they were [rest of the sentence] Line 10 – significance differences Line 11, 12 and 13 - Application of 10t/ha compost significantly produced taller plants at all growing stages and also produced higher leaf number at 6, 8 and 12 weeks after Corrections effected.



SDI Review Form 1.6

		planting. Line 13 – Furthermore, the highest tuber weight was observed from addition of 15t/ha compost. Line 14 – It is concluded that compost application quantities between 10 and 15t/ha improved the growth and tuber yield of cassava. Keywords should be Arial, inclined, 10 font and justified. “Full stop” should be removed.	
	Introduction (<i>Is the problem/objective of this study original, important and well defined?</i>)	Line 19 – was originated in Line 20 – introduced Line 21 – vitamin B and C as well as essential minerals. Line 22 – Cassava is Line 24 – staple food for rural and urban households Line 25 – These industries Line 30 – Cassava is a major food crop in Nigeria and it is Line 32, 33 – It also has a huge potential for the export market which made it a crop that attracts foreign exchange Line 36 – poor households’ consumption Line 35, 36 – Indicate the reference. Line 40 – agricultural Line 44 – improves Line 45 – also helps to improve the activities of micro organisms Line 45 – It adds Line 46 – renders Line 48 – development of cassava Please correct all formatting errors in paragraphs. Otherwise Introduction is good enough.	Corrections effected.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Materials & methods (Kindly comment on the suitability and technical standards of the methods. Sufficient details of the methods/process should be provided so that another researcher is able to reproduce the experiments described)	Line 52 – between 1150mm and 1250mm Line 53 – °C Line 54 – The soil is sandy loamy with pH Line 54-56 – Recheck the sentence and correct all errors. Line 60 – later weeding was Line 61 – The compost manure was Line 62 – Is it 19 or 10? Please correct all formatting errors in paragraphs.	corrected
	Results & discussion (Kindly comment on: 1. Are the data well controlled and robust? 2. Authors should provide relevant and current references during discussion. 3. Discussion and conclusions should be based on actual facts and figures. Biased claims should be pointed out. 4. Are statistical analyses must for this paper? If yes, have sufficient and appropriate statistical analyses been carried out?)	1. Yes. 2. Yes, but current references are insufficient. 3. Yes. 4. Sufficient. Line 72 – produced taller plants Line 78 – significant difference Line 83 – which did not differ Line 90 – This supports Line 91 – a great potential Line 93 – This confirms Line 94 – that compost releases Line 94 – makes available Line 96 – that improve Line 97 – ensured Line 99 – reduced Please correct all formatting errors in paragraphs.	corrected



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Conclusion <i>(Is the conclusion supported by the data, discussed inside the manuscript? Conclusions should not be biased and should be based on the data, presented inside the manuscript only. Authors should provide adequate proof for their claims without overselling them)</i>	Conclusion should be presented as a separate part from Discussion (Please follow guidelines).	done
	References <i>(Are all the references cited relevant and adequate? Are there any other suitable current references authors need to cite?)</i>	In the text, citations should be indicated by the reference number in brackets; example: [1]. The format of reference list should be re-checked. Some formatting errors and lack of uniformity could be identified. Arranged format of references is wrong.	done