SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Asian Journal of Advances in Agricultural Research**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJAAR_50769**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Influence of Kraal Manure, Chicken Manure and Inorganic Fertilizer on Growth, Yield and Post-harvest Quality of Pepper (Capsicum annuum l.) in a Sub-tropical Environment**
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:

(http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline)

SDI Review Form 1.6

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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments	**Abstract.** Specify the treatments applied and mention if the experiment has a control treatment. Define the experimental design applied and mention the statistical analysis used. Present the outstanding results in terms of numbers, on growth rate of the inorganic fertilizer and chicken manure treatments and the grown with chicken manure and chemical fertilizer in the number of days. **Introduction.** The information on the following aspects of capsicum annuum was not properly documented: • On the distribution and climatic and soil requirements. • On the nutritional requirements. • On the socio - economic aspect. • On the apply kraal manure (Boma) use chicken manure and the Synthetic fertilizers. It is noteworthy that the manuscript is limited only address the above mentioned issues on the basis of works by a single author (Norman, 1992), although there are numerous publications on these issues to date. **Materials and methods.** The methodology requires re structuring from the following viewpoints: • Explain Adequately the treatments. • Specify the presence or absence of a control treatment. • Clearly state the measured variables. • Explain in detail the applied experimental design. If it is a factorial design, specify the participant factors (eg Factor A = ??, factor B = ??, etc.). • Because the experiment has control treatment, using Duncan's New Multiple Range Test (DNMRT) is inaccurate.In this case you should use the Dunnett test instead of Duncan test. • The information in Tables 2 and 3 on Nutrient composition of poultry and cattle manure should be used for discussion and not in the Materials and Methods. **Results.** Lines 127-128: Cahnge "There was no significant difference (P<0.05) in plant height of	All corrections done

	pepper treated with 2:3:2(37) and chicken manure" to "There was no significant difference (**P>0.05**) in plant height of pepper treated with 2:3:2(37) and chicken manure".. Line 129 results on height were interpreted in terms of blocks, however, in the methodology section design is not specified in blocks. For all interpretations place the value of the probability (p) after the words "significant differences" The results on growth variables and production of Capsicum annuum were interpreted in very monotonous and repetitive manner. It might be better to integrate all growth variables and interpret them under the heading of growth variables. It is advisable to apply the multiple regression analysis, this in order to verify the relationships between variables of production (yield) with growth variables. **discussion** The results were not adequately discussed with the results of other authors. There is a very poor argument. The authors only limited to the use of information from the following authors: Jacobs *et al* . , 2003; Van Averbeke and Yoganathan, 2003; Ogunlela *et al.,* 2005 and Gandy *et al.,* 2002. Much of the discussions are repeated paragraphs of results. **References** Reported references need to be checked against the text. There are more than 18 references in the literature that were not mentioned in the text.	
Minor REVISION comments		
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)*	

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20