



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Soil Science and Plant Nutrition
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJSSPN_50197
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECT OF POWDERED AND COMPOSTED MEAT BONES ON THE GROWTH AND YIELD OF WATER SPINACH (<i>Ipomoea aquatica</i>)
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	<p>Use an English language editor to edit the grammar</p> <p>Line 9: Insert the problem being addressed and the objective.</p> <p>Line 14: Indicate the percentage increase</p> <p>Line 16: Indicate the major conclusions drawn from the study</p> <p>Lines 24 and 25: Present production figures of 2018 available from FAOSTAT</p> <p>Line 135; How regular was the water application?</p> <p>Line 136: How was optimum moisture determined?</p> <p>Lines 138-140: Indicate how the growth parameters were monitored e.g. days to germination, number of leaves, sizes of leaves. This should include all information presented in section 2.8. 1 to 2.8.1.3</p> <p>Lines 156 to 168 should be part of 2.7.3</p> <p>Line 174; How were statistically significant means separated? Which were the treatments? What was the experimental design?</p> <p>Table 1: Statistically analyse the results</p> <p>Figure 3: You had two objectives, data should thus be analysed and presented separately for the two objectives. For example, data for the powdered bones should be presented differently than that for the composted bones. If there is rationale in comparing the powdered and composted bone meal, the experiment should be a factorial</p> <p>The nutrient contents of the bone meals should be determined to aid in discussion</p>	
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)	



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Rebecca Yegon</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>University of Embu, Kenya</i>