

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Experimental Agriculture International</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JEAI_120633</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>FISH WASTE COMPOST - A FERTILIZER FOR ORGANIC AGRICULTURE</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://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**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> <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 few sentences regarding the importance this manuscript for scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript provides scientific information about the application of fishwaste as alternative source of amelioration/nutrients for plants.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Suitable.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	It needs add information on the composition of fishwaste and its effect.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	NUTRIENT CONTENT OF FISH WASTE, SAWDUST, BANANA AND JAGGERY need to be reword to Nutrient Contents of Agricultural Waste. What authors can say about this?	
Please write few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Discuss the effects of the treatments on seedling performance.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.	The methods used must be included in the Materials and Methods and cite properly.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Incorporation of the results in the abstract must be done. The methods used must be specified in the Materials and methods. Fix the tables making it three or four columns to have a better vision of the difference among the fishwaste, jaggery	

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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:	Raymund Julius G. Rosales
Department, University & Country	Mariano Marcos State University, Philippines