

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Agriculture and Ecology Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAERI_125412
Title of the Manuscript:	Growth and activity of the manure worm <i>Eudrilus eugeniae</i> (Kinberg, 1867) in different substrates made of palm oil empty fruit bunches : Case of vermicompost production
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 correct 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>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The title effectively captures the study's focus, but adding geographical context (Abidjan, Côte d'Ivoire) would provide clarity. 2. The abstract is comprehensive but would benefit from a clearer research objective at the beginning and an expanded conclusion emphasizing practical implications. 3. The introduction provides a solid background but lacks recent references on vermicomposting in similar climates. Adding these would strengthen the rationale. 4. The methodology is detailed, but further explanation is needed on how environmental factors like moisture and temperature were controlled. 5. The choice of using four earthworms per box should be justified, as it may impact the interpretation of population growth results. 6. The results section is concise but lacks graphical representations or tables that would help visualize and compare data across treatments. 7. Discussion highlights relevant findings but could further explore why grass clippings performed better than other substrates in enhancing earthworm growth. 8. The paper should provide more actionable recommendations for palm oil plantations and vermicomposting operations interested in applying these findings. 9. Figures lack detailed captions explaining their relevance, which makes it difficult for readers to understand their importance without cross-referencing the text. 10. References are slightly outdated. Including more recent studies from the last five years would improve the literature review and strengthen the discussion. 	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</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>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>		

Review Form 3

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.		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.		
<u>Minor REVISION</u> comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

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:	Nagaraju LG
Department, University & Country	REVA University, India