Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JSRR_50555**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Efficacy of two (2) organic fertilizer sources (oil palm bunch and vermicast) on the growth response of *Tetrapleura tetraptera***
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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments	Consider revising the title to " Efficacy of Oil palm bunch and Vermicasts organic fertilizers on *Tetrapleura tetraptera* growth Consider whether you are discussing vermicast or vermicompost. If it is vermicompost, you need to explain how the vermicompost was prepared. If Vermicast, you need to explain how you reared the earthworms and the collection of the vermicast. Lines 38, 276:Italicise all scientific names Lines 50-59: Use the same font throughout the document Line 83: Delete of soil before citation Lines 107, 132, 133: Indicate the methods used for soil analyses and whether total or available nutrients were determined specifying the exact macro and micronutrients determined Lines 142-143: Cite the reference used in rating the nutrient content as moderate Line 155: Capitalise the generic name In the discussion relate the findings of the nutrient contents of the organic fertilizers to their performance on crop growth. Also discuss the performance in relation to more studies as well as the nutrient contents obtained in the present study compared to that of previous studies. There is minimal discussion on the effect of the vermicast. Line 199: One recommendation of this is that using 20t/ha seems more economical than 40t/ha since the performance is comparable. In your recommendations, comparing the costs and benefits of these organic fertilizers would be very useful Lines 217-218, 236, 262, 282, 293, 297, 301: Italicise the journal name Line 272: Indicate the name of the journal	The reviewer comments are satisfactory by me. The reviewer did a good job
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General 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)*
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	no