



## SDI Review Form 1.6

### **PART 1:**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Journal of Plant &amp; Soil Science</a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>MS: 2012/IJPSS/2037</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>SPONTANEOUS PLANTS USED IN THE TRADITIONAL SOAP MAKING IN COTE D'IVOIRE</b>

### **General guideline for Peer Review process:** *(Note: Title of different sections as proposed below may differ in case of review paper / case reports)*

- *Is the problem/objective of this study original and important? SCIENCEDOMAIN international strongly opposes the practice of duplicate publication or any type of plagiarism. However, studies which are carried out to reconfirm / replicate the results of any previously published paper with new dataset, may be considered for publication. But these types of studies should have a 'clear declaration' of this matter. If you suspect any unethical practice in this manuscript, kindly write it in the report with some proof/links.*
- *Materials & methods (Kindly comment on the suitability and technical standards of the methods. Sufficient details of the methods/process should be provided so that another researcher is able to reproduce the experiments described)*
- *Results & discussion (Kindly comment on: 1. Are the data well controlled and robust? 2. Authors should provide relevant and current references during discussion. 3. Discussion and conclusions should be based on actual facts and figures. Biased claims should be pointed out. 4. Are statistical analyses must for this paper? If yes, have sufficient and appropriate statistical analyses been carried out?)*
- *Conclusion (Is the conclusion supported by the data, discussed inside the manuscript? Conclusions should not be biased and should be based on the data, presented inside the manuscript only. Authors should provide adequate proof for their claims without overselling them)*
- *Are all the references cited relevant, adequate? Are there any other suitable current references authors need to cite?*
- *SDI believes in constructive criticism. Reviewers are encouraged to be honest but not offensive in their language. It is expected that the reviewer should suggest the authors on how they can strengthen their paper to make it acceptable. Comments of the reviewers should be sufficiently informative and helpful to reach a Editorial Decision. We strongly advise that a negative review should also explain the weaknesses of any manuscript, so that the concerned authors can understand the basis of rejection and he/she can improve the manuscript based on those comments. Authors also should not confuse straightforward and true comments with unfair criticism.*
- *We are very much reluctant to go against suggestions (particularly on technical areas) of the reviewers. Therefore, authors are requested to treat the suggestions of reviewers with utmost importance.*
- *This form has total 9 parts. Kindly note that you should use all the parts of this review form.*



## SDI Review Form 1.6

### **PART 2: Review Comments**

	<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)
<b><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments	Literature cited in material and method was very old. Why not use current literature? Results and discussion lacked relevant and current references. Line 307, 334, 342, 351 etc are more than 10years ago.	Literature cited in material and methods were updated. Recents references have been used in recent results and discussions:  1- Upadhyaya <i>et al.</i> , 2003 2- Verna <i>et al.</i> , 2007 3- Dahare & Jain, 2010 4- Tuberosa <i>et al.</i> , 2010 5- Nacoulma <i>et al.</i> , 2011 6- Ottoson, 2012, 7- Varnika <i>et al.</i> , 2012
<b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments	Statistical analyses are important and were not carried out at all.	Statistics were performed but not introduced into the manuscript. This has been corrected
<b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments	Conclusion was supported by the data and was based on the data presented.	Data were included in conclusion