



**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/2401</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>PERFORMANCE OF OKRA (<i>Abelmoschus esculentus</i> (L) Moench) UNDER VARIOUS APPLICATION OF PESTICIDES AND FERTILIZERS IN OXIC PALEUSTALF</b>

**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 9 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 <i>(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)</i>
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Title:</b> The title needs to be revised to capture the essentials of the work done. The suggested title may be considered.</li> <li>2. <b>The write up is too wordy.</b> There is the need to be more concise and straight to the point.</li> <li>3. <b>The method is not explanatory enough e.g. sample collection, planting method and date, fertilizer grade, NPK?? (see the manuscript)</b></li> <li>4. <b>Result:</b> There are disparities between what is in the table and the write-up. Inferences were not well drawn (See the annotated manuscript)</li> </ol> <p>In general, the result should be re-presented following the suggested merging of the tables.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5. <b>Discussions</b> should follow the trend of the result. It should be re-presented.</li> <li>6. <b>Tables:</b> The tables are too many; they should be merged as suggested. The units of measurements were not indicated. There were no legends to the tables e.g. using the DMRT, the direction of comparison should be stated at the base of the table, so also the level of probability (see the manuscript).</li> <li>7. <b>Conclusion &amp; Recommendation:</b> Conclusion should be strictly based on the result of the experiment. As it is presently, this should be re-presented. There is no recommendation as a fallout of the experiment</li> <li>8. <b>References:</b> Though all inclusive, there is no</li> </ol>	



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

	<b>uniformity in the method of listing. Some listed references do not have pages, while the placements of initials of the authors were not regular.</b>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	NIL	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	NIL	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Anonymous Reviewer</b>
Department, University & Country	