



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Agriculture and Forestry
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRAF_51151
Title of the Manuscript:	THE EFFECTS OF FISH POND SEDIMENTS AND COW DUNG ON THE EARLY GROWTH OF <i>Afromosia elata</i> HARMS SEEDLINGS
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	<p>This study has presented the use of two organic fertilizers, fish pond sediments and cow dungs, at different rates for the growth of seedlings. The research work was carried out well though there are still many gaps to fills before publication. The following comments will be helpful for improving this work.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Introduction: Put paragraph 3 as the first paragraph to introduce the importance of A. elata. Then reorganize the paragraph and elaborate on why using organic fertilizer is important. You can add a last paragraph on the significance of using organic fertilizer. Useful references that should be included: Kit Wayne Chew et al. (2019) Transformation of Biomass Waste into Sustainable Organic Fertilizers. <i>Sustainability</i>. Atman B. Bakrie et al. (2018) Effect of Cow Manure Dosages as Organic Fertilizer on the Productivity of Organic Rice in West Sumatra, Indonesia. <i>International Journal of Environment Agriculture and Biotechnology</i>. 2. Remove the objective of the study and placed it into a last paragraph in Introduction. 3. Line 95: How was the watering done to ensure equal water amounts are received by each seedlings? 4. Line 100: On what basis was the fertilizer treatment selected, for example, why was 2 kg, 1.5 kg and 100g of FPS used, the amounts are highly varying. 5. Line 106: How were each growth parameter test performed? State briefly the method to determine all the parameters. 6. Table 1 and 2: The FPS and DCD were subjected to chemical analysis. Please state this in the Material and methods and write out how the tests were done. 7. Table 3 appears in the manuscript but there is no mention or any explanation on it in the text. 8. Table 4: Error in the first row. Wk100 and Wk1222. 9. Line 145: Use newer references. Explain why there is more phosphorus in fish pond sediments and how it is more useful to support plant growth. 10. Table 5: Error in value in T6. Line 161: How does the application of fish pond sediments make the soil better in terms of soil structure development. 11. Line 197: State which Table. Line 207: Instead of saying the FPS is better, state also why cow dung is unable to produce similarly good results as compared to fish sediments. 12. Discussion: Relate the findings to how fish pond sediments and the control (top soil) perform. Compare between the control and cow dung as well, apart from just cow dung and fish pond sediments. 13. Conclusion: It is worth to consider that since the application rate of FPS and DCD are not the same, whichever has more will likely perform better. Hence, a proper evaluation on 	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	the application rate to fully observe their performance is needed.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

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:	Chew Kit Wayne
Department, University & Country	University of Nottingham, Malaysia