

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advances in Agricultural Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAAR_99657
Title of the Manuscript:	Characterization of a compost made from chicken droppings and fish bones and application to tomato cultivation
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.journalajaar.com/index.php/AJAAR/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)	Manuscript provides prospects for expanded research on the use of locally sourced, eco-friendly alternatives to agricultural inputs. It gives an extensive elaboration on the several parameters that account for soil quality and crop yield. Title not quite comprehensible. Alternative could be "Characterization of compost made from chicken droppings and fish bones, and its application to tomato cultivation" OR "Effects of compost made from chicken dropping and fishbones on soil properties and tomato yield/performance." Abstract is comprehensive Structure and subsections are appropriate Manuscript is scientifically correct References are quite sufficient and recent	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	English language is suitable for scholarly publications	
Optional/General comments	This is a great and excellent job	

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:	Dafil, Raymond Panshak
Department, University & Country	University of Jos, Nigeria