

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Soil Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ASRJ_122450
Title of the Manuscript:	Consequences of Applying Different Poultry Manure Rates on the Fertility Level of an Oxisol and the Agromomic Performance of Okra (<i>Abelmoschus esculentus</i>) in Dschang (Cameroon Western Highlands).
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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.	This is a goof effort to move towards the organic amendments inspite of chemical ones. Rather integrated is most preferable one.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	yes	
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.	yes	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	somehow	
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.	Just one figure 3 needs improve, its not giving scientific touch. Figure notes are also not given. That graph should be revised. Also some unnecessary things are written to make manuscript long/lengthy. So I suggest to be precise and mainly focus on yield enhancement of okra with use of different organic amendments.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	N/A	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Minor revision yes	
Optional/General comments		

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Shabana Ehsan
Department, University & Country	Ayub Agricultural Research Institute, Pakistan