

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Experimental Agriculture International</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JEAI_119682</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Pedological study under cocoa trees to improve production in the Soubré region (southwest of Ivory Coast).</b>
Type of the 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>)

### 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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>1. The article relevant as it addresses an important factor; soil characteristics, constituting cocoa production and yields. It does this by clearly identifying a host of soil properties</p> <p>2. I could suggest the title: "Pedological study under cocoa trees and its implication on production in Soubré, Southwest Region of Ivory Coast"</p> <p>3. Yes. I think the abstract is comprehensive</p> <p>4. I wish to state that the work is properly structured and discusses sub-sections in parts</p> <p>5. Based on the results presented, I believe scientifically, the manuscript is appropriate</p> <p>6. The references are sufficient, despite that I have not confirmed if all cited works are referenced. However, I am not quite sure about the referencing style adopted by the author(s), but they could be consistent with any.</p> <p><b>Further corrections and areas of concern have been highlighted in the work (appearing in bubbles at the right margin). The author(s) could accept changes and address worries where appropriate.</b></p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>I think the language is quite basic, and understandable by a cross-section of stakeholders. However, the author(s) may consider using grammarly to improve.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Norbert Ngoongeh Ngwang</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Biaka University Institute of Buea, Cameroon</b>