



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_43666
Title of the Manuscript:	Adding charcoal residue to the worm humus promotes good results in the production of papaya seedlings
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>)

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	Results as described in the abstract are incorrect. Five treatment of CR were apply 0, 2.5, 7.5, 15 and 30% so it is impossible that the best results are about 9.25 percent to 14.25 percent of the addition of CR. Also the treatment are incorrect in the abstract. Conclusions are incorrect and all results because the author NEVER refers to the real treatments so is very confusing.	When the authors say that the best values obtained from the analyzed variables of papaya plants were with 9% to 14% of the insertion of charcoal residues in the humus, they are referring to the dosage where the highest values were obtained for the variables and therefore the indicated dose for the production of better seedlings. This was calculated by determining the maximum point of the functions obtained by the regression.
Minor REVISION comments	Many acronym without explanation. Macro and micronutrients only one time is necessary to write the complete name, the rest of the time just write the symbol. Some references are incomplete (without year and title).	OK Correction performed Was reviewed
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	