

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_115260
Title of the Manuscript:	Waste Utilization in Horticulture : An Overview
Type of the Article	Review Article

Review Form 1.7

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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. YES, the manuscript topic and subject area are important for the scientific community. Waste utilization and management in Horticulture, has the enormous potential and ability as an emerging field to transform various waste materials into valuable resources needed for sustainable, efficient and productive crop production; which is needed in our modern world where the sustainable development of natural resources has also become a priority area for development. From benefits such as resource management efficiency, soil improvement, cost savings, carbon sequestration, biodiversity enhancement, reduced environmental impact and community engagements/developments; there is no doubt that effective waste utilization in horticulture would very well contribute to the efficient and effective development of modern day agriculture and societies at large. 2. YES; the title of the article is suitable and captures the aims, scope and relevant theories of the research work. 3. NO; the abstract is not comprehensive; as it does not provide a clear summary of the aims and objective of the research, the methodology undertaken, and the specific highlighted results/conclusions of the overview or research. It was more like a summarised overview. The Abstract should be reviewed to fully reflect the core aims and methods of the research work. 4. NO; the subsections and structure of the article was not appropriate. Sections, subsections and necessary adequate labelling like 1., 2., 3...etc, and 1.1, 1.1.1; 1.2, 1.2.1; etc will be more appropriate and should be applied in sections and subsections of the article. Furthermore, relevant sections such as "Literature Review" and "Methodology" should be included in the article. 5. The manuscript is scientifically correct, with latest information; however, it lacks some important data (well-documented statistics) and/or process (diagrammatic or non-diagrammatic) information that are very necessary for such an important, overview of the research area and topic discussed. 6. The references are recent and relevant; but they are not sufficient. A few more references are needed in harmony with the extra recommended resources that should be added to the article. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Aside a few typographical and wording errors; the English language quality of the article is suitable for scholarly publication 	

Review Form 1.7

<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>Additionally, the following points are noted by the Reviewer:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> I. Yes, the paper's argument is built on appropriate theories and ideas. However, more relevant theories, the method of research applied and relevant procedures needs to be made much clearer and should also include some numerical data of the overview that indicates the quantifiable values and how they are distributed in line with relevant case study comparisons, with respect to the subject area discussed. II. The Sections ("Literature Review, Methodology and Limitations/Recommendations"); should be added to describe the limitations related to the research work, and potential future developments. Furthermore, the Methodology of the review study should be made more elaborate (including the use of simple block diagram and/or summarised list of steps) to further help to present the methodology employed and accompanying sub-processes more clearly. III. Relevant well tabulated datasets and/or obtained statistical referenced data or related data-diagrams should be presented to highlight more information of the overview study, including relevant comparative and individual distributions in relation to the subject area, to further improve the richness and informative quality of the scholarly research. IV. The conclusion was observed to provide a good generic summary of the research topic; but it should be made better by mentioning a few major inferences or key observations around specific waste management strategies and value added product(s) from waste processing as described in the paper. <p>The paper identifies very good implications for research, practice and society; and it also has the potential to provide practical solutions to global economies, in addition to creating a good harmony between modern theory and practice. However, more must be done to improve the quality of the paper with respect to the presentation of the Abstract, methods, review and the structural organization of the paper. More data related information and better article clarity are also needed to improve the quality of the paper for journal readership. Additionally, the originality of the paper can also be a bit further improved on in harmony with scholarly article standards.</p>	

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Chikezie Kennedy Kalu</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Jiangsu University, China</p>