

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_117394
Title of the Manuscript:	Impact of organic fertilizers on guava (<i>Psidium guajava</i> L.) yield
Type of the Article	Research 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.journaljeai.com/index.php/JEAI/editorial-policy>)

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> <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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Yes. it is important to the community to identify the best organic treatment to apply to increase the yield of the plant</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes. Better to add a sentence with a conclusion.</p> <p>Structure is fine. But the methodology is not clearly mentioned in the body. Improve the methodology with the suggested comments in the main text. However include the objective of the study to the introduction</p> <p>Without introducing any statistical analysis, comparison of the results are wrong. So it can improve by adding the name of the test.</p> <p>One reference is suggested in the reviewed Introduction.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>It is better if it is possible to improve more.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>This is suitable for short communication. However it should be improved by the comments are included in the main text. I would like to request the author to go through my comments in the reviewed paper and upgrade it.</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><u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u></p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	J I K G Jayalath
Department, University & Country	The Open University of Sri Lanka, Sri Lanka