

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Crop Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCS_125320
Title of the Manuscript:	GROWTH AND YIELD OF LETTUCE (<i>Lactuca sativa</i> L.) IN RESPONSE TO ORGANIC FERTILIZER TYPES IN MAKURDI, NIGERIA
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please corrects the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>This manuscript is interesting because it focuses on organic fertilizers as an alternative to mineral fertilizers. In this way, the health of the soil and the environment is improved, and the results are better yields of cleaner pure food.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>I can accept that the title is appropriate. Authors can also consider the comparison between the two varieties such as: „Effect of some organic fertilizers on.....“</p>	
<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>	<p>I think the summary is comprehensive enough. It can be shorter. There are some inaccuracies - the measurement units of the values are missing. The authors have described them in 3 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION 3.1 Vegetative Growth of Lettuce as influenced by variety and different organic fertilizer Application I recommend that they be filled in the same way in the summary itself, in the tables etc.</p> <p>In the results section in figures 1, 2, 3 and 4 there are nomenclature inscriptions such as: “CD”, “PD”, and “GM”. In the results section in figures 1, 2, 3 and 4 there are nomenclature inscriptions such as: It is not well understood what exactly they mean? Please write in material and methods: Cow dung (CD), Poultry dropping (PD), goat manure (GM)</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate for scholarly publication. The texts are correctly written, I have no notes to the authors. However, when using formulas it is good to complete them with their authors, for example: GGR (2) - Watson, D.J. (1952). The physiological basis of variation in yield. Advances in Agronomy 4, 101–145 2.7 Statistical Data Analysis</p> <p>GENSTAT statistical software - GenStat is a data analysis and statistical software tool produced by VSN International, etc....</p> <p>I draw attention to the authors to unify the citation in the text according to the requirements of the journal. Sources are found both with a number in parentheses and as names and years.</p> <p>Please comply with the requirements of the journal when arranging and writing the references. The order is not correct.</p>	
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>The research is fully comparable to many other similar documents that I have been able to find. It also offers an interesting organic combination and good experimental design and scientific methodology. I would recommend the authors to do the study three times (over three growing seasons in several consecutive years).</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =</p>	<p>The references are sufficient and recent. I recommend more sources and authors related to the material and methods section.</p>	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The material is written in appropriate English	
Optional/General comments	Generally, materials for publication should cover a minimum of 2 years of research. This is for a period of one year. While writing this review, I have checked and found that there are enough other similar studies with a period of one year as well. This may be sufficient grounds for the material to be published. However, it is strongly recommended that the team continue the study for 2 or 3 years and make a publication with more data. A comparison for statistical significance between different types of fertilizers can be made, as well as a variant with mineral fertilizer can be included.	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Nadezhda Shopova
Department, University & Country	CAWRI-BAS, Bulgaria