



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Applied Science & Technology</u>
Manuscript Number:	2013_BJAST_4656
Title of the Manuscript:	An Evaluation of the Effects of Organic and Inorganic Fertilizers on the Growth Performance of Three Timber Species: Cedrella odorata L., Entandrophragma angolensis Welw. and Terminalia superba Diel., in Nursery
Type of the Article	Research paper

General guideline for Peer Review process is available in this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

- This form has total 7 parts. Kindly note that you should use all the parts of this review form.



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2: 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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	1-There are many references not in the text: Bungard et al (2000), Burslem et al (1995), Groves and Keraitis (1976), Guantilleke et al (1994), Hall et al (2003), Hector (2000), Ichie et al (2001), Pinkard et al (2007), Pooter (1990), Raaimakers and tambers (1996). 2-There are many references in the text and not in the reference section: Offiong et al (2010), Abod and Siddiqui (2002), Mariswamy et al (2011), Jacobs et al (2003), Rastovski (1997), Okeke and Omaliko (1997),Ingested (1979 b). 3- Some references are not the same in the text as in the reference section: Lawrence (1998) in the reference, (2003) in the text, Ndam and Fraser(1998) in the reference, Ndam (1998) in the text, Ang and Maruyama (1995) in the references, Ang et al (1995) in the text.	Corrections have been effected in the reference section and in the text. All references have been cited in the text following the instruction to authors by the journal.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Some corrections are needed and I've adverted it in the text (find attached)	



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The article concept is not new although the manuscript is well written and well designed .It was preferable that the chemical analysis of the poultry droppings would be done to compare between it and the inorganic fertilizers used in this work. It needs moderate revision specially the references before it is accepted for publication .	