



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advances in Agricultural Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAAR_48987
Title of the Manuscript:	Yield of Okra (Abelmoschus esculentus L. Moench) Varieties as Influenced by the Application of Cow Dung and Poultry Manure in Jega, Kebbi State, Nigeria
Type of the Article	Original research paper

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>)

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>Good original research paper fit for publication by AJAAR. The study is well articulated, methodology is replicable and the findings scientifically robust. However, some amendments are needed before the paper can be considered for publication:</p> <p>Firstly, at the level of data analysis procedure, the statistical software(s) used for data analysis should be highlighted and the rationale underlying the use of the statistical software(s) explained.</p> <p>Secondly, the discussion of the study's findings should be done in a more analytical and comparative manner. The analytical approach of discussing the study's findings implies that plausible justifications be given for each finding. It doesn't just suffice to describe the findings of the paper. The comparative approach of discussing the study's findings involves comparing and contrasting the findings of the study with the findings of other authors who have conducted related research. Thus, the author(s) of the paper should source for the most recent scientific publications (2014 – 2019) in the domain and use them to discuss the findings of the study. A good analytical and comparative discussion of a study's findings gives the findings more depth, scientific relevance and robustness.</p> <p>Last but not the least, the practical and policy implication of the study should be highlighted as this could go a long way to the aid the decision making process of policy makers involved in the sector.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	The most recent publications (2014 – 2019) in the domain should be sourced and used at the level of the introduction as well as in discussing the paper's findings.	
Optional/General comments	Good paper fit for publication by AJAAR. However, the afore-cited points should be taken into account before the paper is considered for publication.	



SDI Review Form 1.6

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:	<i>Nyong Princely Awazi</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>University of Dschang, Cameroon</i>