SCIENCEDOMAIN *international*
www.sciencedomain.org

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 Afrormosia elata 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)

SCIENCEDOMAIN *international*
www.sciencedomain.org

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	1. Key words – please write the whole latin name of research species "*Afrormosia elata"* instead od "*A. elata*". 2. Abstract – line 22: Please at first mention "TS" write the whole term and afterwards could be use the abbreviation 3. Introduction – line 61:format the text "high value in the international market cannot be overemphasized" (it is written in Garamond font, should be in Times new Roman); line 62: please delete the brackets "(Harms)"; line 63: replace "*Pericopsis elata* (Harms)" with "*Pericopsis elata* (Harms) van Meeuwen"; line 64: replace "Tracheopyta" with correctly written "Tracheophyta"; line 64 and 65: all latin name e.g. Tracheophyta , Fabaceae should be written in *italic* font style; line 66: replace "semi-deciduous" with "semi - deciduous" (where is left one space); line 69: replace "colouration" with "coloration". 4. Material and Methods – line 86: please write the geographic coordinates latitude and longitude correctly by Using degrees, minutes, and seconds; line 89: the same remark for the temperature "31. 2^{0}C"; line 90: leave the space "eco-climate" and write it as "eco - climate"; line 95: replace "daily (morning)" with more clear explanation "daily at the morning"; line 95: replace "S.E" with "SE"; line 102: after first mentioning please use the abbreviations given in Abstract for these terms "fish pond sediments" (FPS) and "decomposed cow dung" (DCD); line 106: please use the small first letter "Parameters"; line 109: replace "ANOYA" with "ANOVA". 5. Results and Discussion – Table 1: please replace "cmol/Kg" with "cmol/kg"; What is written correctly in Tables 1 and 2 according to the propositions? "*Parameters", "Quantity"* or "Parameters", "Quantity"? The authors should use the uniquie way of writing according the journal propositions!!!; In Table 1 is used the font size 14 differs of the Table 2 where the results are written in font size 16?! Please unify it!; The results in Table 4 are written in 12 font size??? Please unify it!; The abbreviations (e.g.: Trt , Wk etc.) used in Table 4 must give an explanation of what they mean, best under the table; line 138: At first mention must be given of the full term of the term and then used again as an abbreviation "CD"; The authors use a different style of writing the subheadings in the tables, somewhere Italian, somewhere regular. Compulsory to unify. In some places in the tables and text the treatment number is written in bold (line 135: T**3**) or italic style (line T***2***), should be written in regular style and throughout the text unified; line 166: delete one point ". "; Table 6: Should probably stand "4.52" instead of " .4.52 „; line 174: Why is used the capital first letter "Fish"; line 175: delete one space between the words, there are two left and write phosphorous with first small letter "of Phosphorus"; line 176, 178 and 179: please write the "Potassium" and "Nitrogen " with first small letter; line 197: please write the number of the Table the authors are referring; Table 8: Why the content is written in italic style?; line 199: after the table should be left the space before starting the text; line 206: is is not acceptable to be written like this "Fish Pond Sediments", thereby the authors have two choises: to write with small first letters or use the abbreviation FPS. 6. Conclusions – please use the small first letters (e. g. Nitrogen, Phosphorus, Potassium and Organic matter). 7. References – please check the correct name, for example in line 73 the authors are	

	given as “Burslen and Miller”, but in references line 235 as “Burslen and Millers”; please check the “Yakuiti –ge” and “Yakup>tiyage” and write them correctly; line 258: leave one space “Rath, K. R.(2000)”; line 268-271: The same reference “ Yang, H., Hu, B. (2002)....” is given two times, delete one.	
Minor REVISION comments	The authors should format the whole text again (e.g. line 77: whether space be left below and above the sub-chapter according to the propositions? In other places it is just too much left space (e.g. line 122-124) The layout of the tables must be unified, so for example the table 1, 2 and 3 are differ in the font size and design?!	
Optional/General comments	Many technical disadvantages have been documented in the text of the manuscript, so it is essential for authors to revise and make corrections where necessary in order to be published.	

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)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	***Suzana Jordanovska***
Department, University & Country	***Saints Cyril and Methodius University of Skopje, Macedonia***