

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Journal of Soil Science and Plant Nutrition</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJSSPN_120669</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Recycling Selected Wetlands' Sediments: Evaluation for a Vegetable Crop Cultivation in Terrestrial Ecosystem of a Humid Region</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write few sentences regarding the importance this manuscript for scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript is relevant for the scientific community, has it addressed the importance of wetlands sediments to grow crops. I like the manuscript because it has a direct application of the findings to improve the fertilizations of soils with wetlands sediments.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, it is very suitable.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract is comprehensive? However, there is an acronym "CRD" is not specified in the abstract. Authors should explain the meaning there.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, it is.	
Please write few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript is scientifically correct, because the authors bring concepts that are scientifically known in the scientific community. Furthermore, the methodology is coherent and robust and the results are well discussed in the discussion section of the manuscript.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.	Yes. However, the authors cited Wikipedia in two parts of the article. Therefore, I don't encourage them to cite scientific articles, book chapters, books and conference papers instead of Wikipedia.	
Minor REVISION comments  Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language is academically suitable.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The article is relevant. However, I wonder whether the recycling of wetlands sediments in large scale for growing crops could be ecologically dangerous for the wetland areas or not.	

**PART 2:**

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

**Review Form 3**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Cesar Antoio Mubango Hogueane</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Save University, Mozambique</b>