



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Soil Science and Plant Nutrition</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJSSPN_47320
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of the organic and mineral fertilization on the growth and the production of the sweet potato ( <i>Ipomoea batatas</i> (L) Lam) in the centre of Côte d'Ivoire
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><b>Title:</b> Ipomoea batatas <i>Ipomoea batatas</i> ( It should be inclined/italicized)</p> <p><b>Abstract:</b>  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Use different sub-section names (Aims, Study design, Place and Duration of the Study, Methodology, Results and Conclusion), as given in the MS word SDI paper template.</li> <li>- t/ha t.ha<sup>-1</sup>, kg/ha kg.ha<sup>-1</sup></li> <li>- "Thirteen treatments from the combination of the 8 fertilizers levels" Specify treatments!</li> <li>- The effect of the mineral fertilizer treatment had a positive impact on yield components</li> <li>- Your conclusion is not one. What is (are) recommended treatment (s)? Rewrite this part! The conclusion does not begin by however!</li> <li>- Put keywords alphabetically!</li> <li>- Keywords should be inclined (italicized)</li> </ul> </p> <p><b>Site description</b>  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Station of Search, Research???</li> <li>- sablo-clayey ??? sandy-clayey???</li> <li>- 25,73 C 25,73 °C</li> </ul> </p> <p><b>Vegetable Plant material</b>  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The plant material was constituted constituted of ... with orange flesh to know Irene and TIB-440060</li> <li>- Figure 1- Fig. 1. Figures/Tables titles should be in bold</li> </ul> </p> <p><b>Fertilizing material</b>  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The fertilizing materials ... fertilizer, to know an organic...</li> <li>- Artificial Chemical fertilizers were consisted...</li> </ul> </p> <p><b>Experimental design</b>  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- So, the artificial chemical fertilizer</li> <li>- 3m 3 m, 1m 1 m, 1,5m 1,5 m</li> <li>- t/ha t.ha<sup>-1</sup>, kg/ha kg.ha<sup>-1</sup></li> <li>- Table I- Table 1. Figures/Tables titles should be in bold</li> </ul> </p> <p><b>Results</b>  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Figure 2: Fig. 2. Table II: Table 2. Table III: Table 3. Table IV: Table 4. Table V: Table 5. Table VI: Table 6. Figures/Tables titles should be in bold</li> <li>- For treatments, T1 (KPN 15-15-15) with a number of 168 tuberous roots was significantly different from T11 (KPN 12-22-22)... False (P. = .999, not significant!)</li> <li>- The effect of the control treatment was significantly different from that of T1 (200 kg/ha NPK 15 15 15). False P. = .999, not significant!</li> <li>- Chemical fertilizer treatments were significantly different from the control and manure treatments. False P. = .999, not significant!</li> <li>- the witness the control</li> <li>- This average yield was significantly different from the effect of manure treatment (P &lt; 0,05). False P. = .999, not significant!</li> <li>- fresh tuberoses???</li> <li>- P&lt;0,05 P&lt; 05, P&gt;0,05 P&gt; 05</li> </ul> </p> <p><b>Conclusion</b>  "Results show that mineral treatments influenced agronomic parameters" I disagree! The variety effect is different to the treatment effect!</p> <p><b>TREATMENT EFFECT:</b>  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- number of marketable tuberous roots: P: 0.653</li> <li>- tuberous root weights : P: 0.999</li> </ul> </p>	<p>Thank you very much for your meticulous checking. We have done the corrections.</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>- yield: P: 0.999</p> <p><b>References</b> References are poorly written. Authors must follow the guidelines for writing references.</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	English syntax errors have been detected in the text. Vocabulary and grammar should be revised. Re-reading of the manuscript (native speaking English) is strongly recommended. The manuscript is very poorly divided into two, making reading difficult. The lines of the manuscript should be numbered to favor the postponement of remarks.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

PART 2:

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)	