

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural and Horticultural Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJHR_121879
Title of the Manuscript:	VARIETAL RESPONSE OF AFRICAN EGGPLANT (<i>Solanum aethiopicum</i> L.) TO COMPOST TEA IN SUDAN SAVANNA AGRO-ECOLOGICAL ZONE OF NIGERIA
Type of the Article	

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.	I believe this article is of great importance as it focuses on a climate-friendly approach to improve crop production and the well-being of other living beings, including animals and humans. The reason I appreciate this manuscript is that it is unique, and the author has adopted the innovative idea of utilizing alternatives to chemical fertilizers. This approach minimizes risks to other beings, reduces costs, and promotes the production of healthier crops.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	VARIETAL RESPONSE OF AFRICAN EGGPLANT (<i>SOLANUM AETHIOPICUM</i> L.) TO THE APPLICATION OF COMPOST TEA AT THE AGRO-ECOLOGICAL ZONE OF SUDAN SAVANNA NIGERIA	
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.	The abstract section of this article appears to be well-written, with the exception of a few comma errors, an uncentered title, spacing issues, and a lack of scientific terminology terms.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Throughout the article, particularly in the introduction section, I have noticed grammatical mistakes. Additionally, the equipment used to measure the parameters mentioned is not specified. I suggest the author enhance the scientific writing and include details about the equipment used in the Materials and Methods section.	
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.	The maximum and minimum values are not mentioned in the explanation of the results within the Results section. However, there are grammatical errors, misplaced commas, and a lack of scientific terminology. Overall, this article seems logical both technically and scientifically.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes. I believe the references are sufficient.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	There is a need to improve the scientific writing and correct grammatical mistakes.	
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)	

Review Form 3

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sajeel Hussain
Department, University & Country	The University of Agriculture, Pakistan