



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Journal of Plant &amp; Soil Science</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_48494
Title of the Manuscript:	Differential biomass accumulation among African leafy vegetables as affected by wastewater irrigation in Kutui county, Kenya
Type of the Article	Original Research 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p><b>Abstract:</b></p> <p>1- It should contain more methodological information in a cohesive way.</p> <p><b>Materials and Methods:</b></p> <p>1- Fisher's statistical test does not control the error rate of the experiment, so use the Tukey test that results in confidence intervals with the same size for all differences (smaller intervals) with greater confidence.</p> <p>2- How was irrigation management performed? What methodology has been adopted? How much wastewater was applied in each treatment? What is the origin of the wastewater used? What are the chemical characteristics of wastewater? Is domestic sewage really rich in heavy metals? Was there any control treatment with water and conventional fertilization?</p> <p>3- What were the plant species used? Has the number of plants been pruned in the experimental plots? Standardization is important so that the extraction of the solution of water and nutrients from the soil is uniform.</p> <p>4- What were the factors / aspects analyzed of the cultivated vegetables and the methodologies adopted (bibliographical references)? Why did the evaluations occur in 6 and 12 weeks?</p> <p><b>Results and discussion:</b></p> <p>1- Why was there a comparison between species? Would not it be more appropriate to compare cultivation systems (S1x S2 xGH)? Because as distinct species consequently the habit of growth and the structure of plants (shoot, stem and root) are also very different.</p> <p>2- The presentation of a table presenting the chemical characteristics of the wastewater worked is of extreme importance, helping in the study of the analyzes carried out and giving technical background to the study and the discussion.</p> <p>3- The discussion presents information on nutrients essential to plant growth, such as phosphorus and potassium. But how many of these elements were found and applied in the plots?</p> <p><b>Conclusion:</b></p> <p>1- Is the use of wastewater for irrigation of leafy vegetables safe for human consumption, knowing that these vegetables will be eaten fresh?</p>	<p>Agreed</p> <p>1. Let it remain that way- Fisher's test is equally sufficient for the work</p> <p>2. The information on chemical characteristic is available but the aim of this particular publication was to screen the most common and popular vegetables grown in the region and how they respond to waste water. Indeed, the current results achieved the objective and the results best discussed on the basis of fair and logical speculations that well supported the findings.</p> <p>3. Species used were kale, black nightshade, amaranth and cowpea - There were no pruning of plants but there were serial harvesting.</p> <p>4. what factor? The treatments were the plant species within wastewater. The 6 and 12 weeks coincided with vegetative and start of reproductive stages of the most crop species. Week 6 and 12 are the most critical growth stages for vegetables</p> <p>Results and discussion</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. This is what we set out to address. S1, S2 and GH were not cultivation methods...(we prefer the results presentation to remain as they are).</li> <li>2. Let it remain that way</li> <li>3. The discussion was obviously through very logical speculation with lots of support of previous work from previous researchers in this field. These we just sufficient enough for this kind of work presented which compares well with previous researchers.</li> </ol> <p>There was no application of fertilizers or any other source of mineral nutrition, It is speculated that waste water contains these particular nutrients beneficial for plants (we have dozes of literature to that effect)</p> <p>Due to fresh water scarcity, waste water is commonly used in urban and peri-urban areas hence formed the basis of this screening .</p>
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> 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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	There were no ethical issues in this manuscript