

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Crop Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCS_98514
Title of the Manuscript:	Soil Physical Properties as Influence by Poultry and Cow dung from Different Housing and Stacking Types Following Telfairia Occidentalis (Hook F.) Production
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:

(<https://www.journalajrcs.com/index.php/AJRCS/editorial-policy>)

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. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	1. Yes, the manuscript is important for scientific community. AS proper management of the soil nutritional content and physicochemical properties are core condition for agriculture, the research findings provide good information. 2. Yes, it is suitable 3. The abstract should contain the following components: background of the study, objective, methods, results, conclusion and recommendation, all in short concise and to the point sentences. This abstract is not informative. Yes, they are proper 4. Absolutely correct. However, the discussion part needs revisit. The results should be substantiated properly with other findings particularly on standard application of agricultural inputs and optimum and minimum rats of agricultural inputs. Plus to that, it could have been so informative if the nutritional composition of the Poultry Manure and Cow dung was studied before application (amendment). 5. As it is now sufficient. But, I suggest including more when the authors revisit the discussion part.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language used is appropriate.	
Optional/General comments	The introduction is too short and does not show the reason for the study properly.	

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)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Beyene Dobo
Department, University & Country	Hawassa University, College of Natural and Computational Sciences, Ethiopia