

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Agriculture and Ecology Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAERI_95370
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of tillage methods, farmyard manure and potassium rates on some soil chemical properties and nutrient contents in cassava in Kagera, Tanzania
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:

(<https://www.journaljaeri.com/index.php/JAERI/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. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	1. It might be important, however, the objective of the study is not clearly stated, how important (economic value) is the nutritional value of cassava leaves, and what are the types of soils in the three locations? There are no "research questions" or hypotheses" in the Introduction. There is no information on the interaction between soil tillage methods and the subplot which might be important and could reveal some interesting findings 2. The title is suitable 3. The abstracts provide the whole content of the paper, although it did not cover the objective etc as indicated in point 1 4. The subsection and structure is O.k. 5. The statistical analyses could be improved. The structure of the treatment is obvious, so planned comparison might be more appropriate. 6. Reference is o.k	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	o.k	
Optional/General comments	The presentation of the table could be improved, for example, the term sta , sla, dv etc is not necessarily to be put on the body of tables, it might just need to explain on the notes of the table. This will avoid the "crowded table", and the reader can interpret the data clearly. I don't understand what are 4 MT and 8 MT stand for in the farmyard manure (for example 4MT/ha)	

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Muhamad Sabran
Department, University & Country	Indonesia