

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Crop Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCS_109892
Title of the Manuscript:	Productivity of radish fertilized with a mixture of hairy woodrose (<i>Merremia aegyptia</i> L.) and carnauba straw (<i>Copernicia prunifera</i>).
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>The adverse effects of continuous use of chemical fertilizers on the soil and crop yield is known hence, smallholders are now showing considerable inclination towards the use of organic fertilizers. With this in mind, it is therefore significant to state that the manuscript "Productivity of radish fertilized with a mixture of hairy woodrose (<i>Merremia aegyptia</i> L.) and carnauba straw (<i>Copernicia prunifera</i>)" is very relevant to researchers.</p> <p>Yes the title of the manuscript is ok however I would have suggested a slight modification to "Evaluating the productivity of radish fertilized with a mixture of hairy woodrose (<i>Merremia aegyptia</i> L.) and carnauba straw (<i>Copernicia prunifera</i>)"</p> <p>The abstract is comprehensive</p> <p>Very appropriate</p> <p>The manuscript is very relevant with current research</p> <p>All the references cited in the body of this paper appear in the reference list</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The grammar in this manuscript is acceptable and above average. It is suitable for scholarly communications however author should look out for minor grammatical corrections and include the words in RED (and / a) on page 2 as detected in the paper in the final manuscript</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound however I think the author should clearly state the methods used in the methodology. The research should follow already established agronomic guidelines and author should quote relevant authority in his methodology. Overall, the paper is acceptable for publication.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Joseph Ekenwosu
Department, University & Country	Imo State University, Nigeria