

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_122598
Title of the Manuscript:	Composting cow dung enriched with vivianite (phosphocompost) for agricultural use in the Balaza Lawane locality (Far North, Cameroon).
Type of the Article	Research

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>
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.	As there is a worldwide decreasing trend in the area cultivated for crops, it is important to discover ways of how to increase productivity per unit area and the results of this study are a good contribution. It is also important that resources, in this study-vivianite, available in the locality are utilized. One more significance is that the phosphocomposts produced as soil amendment can be used to reduce the chemical fertilizers applied to crops, and hence help improve the soil and the environment.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is well-stated.	
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, I want to suggest revisions. First, on the Aims . The aim or objective should summarize the purpose of the study. It should answer why the study is conducted. Second, on the Study Design . The study design refers to the methods and methodologies used in research to gather the data needed to explore a specific question and attain the objectives of the study. The common study designs are descriptive, experimental, correlational and others. This study used experimental design. and Third, on the Conclusion . I suggest that it be stated, <i>"Compost enriched with 20% vivianite produced more available phosphorus</i>	

	<p><i>and showed no phytotoxicity in terms of seed germination rate and gemination index. This phosphocompost can be effective crop amendment on Balaza Lawane soil based on its physicochemical characteristics as well as that of the soil.</i></p> <p>I suggested this modification because to state that <i>“the phosphocompost is proven to be the most effective crop amendment on Balaza Lawane soil”</i> lacks basis. No crop production experiment with the use of phosphocompost was conducted in Balaza Lawane soil. Results can only imply that the phosphocompost can be effective but not yet tested and proven.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate; however, I want to suggest that a subsection describing the cow dung use in composting be included under MATERIALS AND METHODS. I suggest that it be listed before Rock phosphate. Therefore, the subsections will be:</p> <p>2.2 Cow dung 2.3 Rock phosphate</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 manuscript is scientifically and technically sound. It contains the elements, IMRAD and Conclusion. The words/terms used, and the sentences are appropriate for a technical paper. The methods applied are clearly stated.</p> <p>However, I suggest that this statement in the Conclusion, <i>“Also, the phytotoxicity test carried out on soya beans shows that our phosphocomposts are not phytotoxic and can be used to amend crops.”</i> be stated as</p> <p><i>“Also, the phytotoxicity test carried out on germination of soya beans shows that our phosphocomposts are not phytotoxic based on germination rate and germination index and can be used to amend crops.”</i></p> <p>I suggested these revisions because no experiment was done in the field. The effects may be different in the field and on different growth stages of the crop.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional</p>	<p>Yes, the references sufficient and recent.</p>	

references, please mention them in the review form. =		
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, as I have earlier stated, the words/terms used, and the sentences are appropriate for a technical paper.	
Optional/General comments	The findings are a good contribution to the body of knowledge in agriculture.	

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:	Elena M. Manaig
Department, University & Country	College of Agriculture, Laguna State Polytechnic University, Philippines