



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Applied Life Sciences International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JALSI_48748
Title of the Manuscript:	Nitrogen Doses And Humic Substances In Custard Apple Nutrition
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>)

**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>Good original research paper very much fit for publication by JALSI. The paper is well articulated, the methodology is good and technically sound, and the findings scientifically robust. However, the following should be looked into before the paper is considered for publication.</p> <p>The discussion of the study's findings should be properly done i.e. the comparative approach should be adopted. The author(s) of the paper should therefore compare and contrast the findings of the paper with the findings of other authors who have conducted related research in other parts of the world. The author(s) of the paper should make use of the most recent publications (2014 – 2019) in the domain to discuss the findings of the paper. This will give the findings of the paper more relevance and scientific robustness.</p> <p>Last but not the least, the policy implications of the study should be given in order to add more weight to the research findings of the study.</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Good original research paper almost ripe for publication. However, the aforementioned comments and evaluations should be taken into account before the paper is considered for publication.	

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