

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Agriculture and Ecology Research International
Manuscript Number:	Original Manuscript_JAERI_117839
Title of the Manuscript:	RESPONSE GROWTH AND YIELD OF GUSTAVI VARIETY TOMATO (Solanum Lycopersicum Mill) GUSTAVI VARIETY TO COW MANURE VERMICOMPOST AND NASA LIQUID ORGANIC FERTILIZER
Type of the Article	Research

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> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>The research has potential for contributing the body of knowledge, however;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The article is poorly written with several spelling and grammatical errors. 2. The methods should set out a clear step by step approach used for the study. 3. The results table did not display the p-values. 4. An initial soil analysis was not done to determine the soil nutrient contribution or dosage requirement. This implies that the results of this study can not be broadly applied. 5. An explanation should be proffered why 28th days data was significant while others aren't. 6. The tables should indicate means and standard deviations. 7. More detail as to how the single fruit was selected. 8. Information of the nutrient requirement of this type of plant with time should be presented for added analysis. 9. Duplication in title should be addressed. 10. Conclusion should provide implication/s of the study. 11. Any assumptions made should be clearly stated. <p>Once the items are addressed the manuscript can be reconsidered.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Clairmont Clementson
Department, University & Country	National Agricultural Research and Extension Institute, Guyana