



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_40670
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of substrate treated with tannery sludge on growth and anatomy of conilon coffee cuttings
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 (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	In the conclusion, the author alludes to the potential for 20% dehydrated sludge in the substrate as a showing potential for use as a substrate for coffee plants. However, this important conclusion is not mentioned anywhere in the abstract, yet many readers would probably stop at the abstract without reading the entire article, or even looking at the conclusion.	Information on the potential use of 20% of tannery sludge was added in the abstract.
Minor REVISION comments	Introduction, - Line 41: ... it is evident that when plants...; please add 'that' in this sentence. Materials and methods - Line 63: Two phrases are used, following each other, i.e. 'consisted of' and 'comprised of'. Please delete one. - Lines 76 to 90: Present the data for the characteristics of soil, dehydrated sludge and manure in Table form, for clarity. You may then present the narrative about the characteristics of the three materials, in the results section. - Line 112: The word 'submitted' is used instead of 'subjected', are these two synonymous? Results - Table 2 & 3: Delete the sludge concentrations (10, 20, 30 and 40%) from the title since these are clearly presented in the Table. - Line 156-157: this sentence is not clear. Part the sentence on line 157, i.e. '...but also the treatment with conventional...' is not connected with the previous. - Line 164: Did you mean Anatomical examination instead of Atomic absorption spectrophotometry? - Line 168: The word should be 'observed' instead of 'documented'. - Line 171: Did you mean T-C instead of C-T? Discussion - How do the Cr concentrations presented in Table 2 compare with the values expected in the leaves of coffee seedlings of that growth stage, according to the literature? - Based on the Cr levels in the tissue with increasing sludge (Table 2), what level of sludge would you recommend as environmentally safe and not affect the quality of coffee? - Line 239: Give examples of the authors being referred to. Conclusion - Line 289: Delete the word 'which' from this sentence.	Introduction Fixed the introduction Materials and methods The methodology was corrected according to the opinion of the evaluator, however, the authors still believe that the characteristics of the soil, tannery sludge and beef cattle should be in the form of text and not table, to occupy less space. If the evaluator finds it very important to present this information in the form of a Table, the authors will transpose this information into Tables. Results The concentrations (10, 20, 30 and 40%) as deleted by the evaluator in tables 2 & 3 were deleted. Line 156-157: The phrase was rewritten again and made clear in the text, since it was very confusing before. Line 164: The correction was made. The other suggested corrections were also made Discussion The weights made by the broker Conclusion The weights made by the broker
Optional/General comments		