

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_118542
Title of the Manuscript:	Mixture effect of rock phosphate and triple superphosphate on maize yield in acid soils of Cote d'Ivoire
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> <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>	<p>This academic paper sets excellent goals for handling and discussing this important topic. The manuscript has been structured, and organized with perfection. The manuscript contains an original contribution and is validated by strong experimental evidence. The scientific points are shown to be perfect, and they are fully supported by recent references. The reader can fully comprehend the concept and techniques of the current study due to the availability of the specified details compared to previous research studies. This academic paper provides an in-depth explanation of all the scientific tests and is completely supported by recent references. The core concept of this work is crucial. I propose that this original work be accepted after minor adjustments have been made.</p> <p>Your abstract was poorly written. I was missing more in-depth information on the actual affects. I think it would be helpful if the writers included additional data tables, diagrams, and figures that can be support all of your modes of action. Carefully adjust the text size and font. The language is a mess of fragmented sentences and poor arrangement. The text involves the most repetition of a number of verbs and phrases.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 		
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

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)
<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>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Shahira H. EL-Moslamy
Department, University & Country	Genetic Engineering and Biotechnology Research Institute, City of Scientific Research and Technological Applications, Egypt