

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	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:

(<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	2. Title should use the word "manure" instead of "dung"	
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. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	3. Abstract lacks data / values of different measured parameters 4. It has not been stated anywhere in the manuscript that how different housing methods and staking systems can affect the stored manure. The author must give the reason for this study in the introduction section. Further there is no analysis of different types of manures before and after the storage. To highlight what changes the storage and staking methods have brought in the manure. The authors should give such a table in the Materials and Methods section. 5. Only bulk density and moisture content have been measured which are not sufficient to given any idea about the benefits of the applied manures. The hydraulic conductivity is not important because the manures were applied on the surface that may not have changed the hydraulic conductivity of the soil profile. Therefore the measurements made in the manuscript are not sufficient to draw any useful conclusion. 6. References are recent	
Minor REVISION comments		
1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
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)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Shahzada Sohail Ijaz
Department, University & Country	Institute of Soil & Environmental Sciences, PMAS-Arid Agriculture University, Pakistan