



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	2015_IJPSS_16111
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparative assessment of cocoa pod husk biochar fortified with NPK fertilizer formulations on kola seedling nutrient uptake and soil properties in Ibadan, Nigeria.
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>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<p>Comparative assessment of cocoa pod husk biochar fortified with NPK fertilizer</p> <p>3 formulations on kola seedling nutrient uptake and soil properties in Ibadan, Nigeria</p> <p>COMMENTS: The ms is original work and the data presented is novel. The presentation has been good and can be accepted subjected to revisions. The M &M section well described and presented. The tables presented are appreciated and statistical analysis conducted is appropriate. Syntax errors and typos noted and should be fixed in the revised version. Some parts of the ms need minor revisions with respect to the language. Please include list of all abbreviations used in the ms in an alphabetical manner. The introduction has been too abrupt and short and was difficult to follow. Please avoid unnecessary repetitions in the results and discussion section. It is without proper focus and should be reduced in content. Please do not add random sentences and review content from other literature sources, discussion should focus in explaining your results with respect to similar studies. Hence no need to repeat entire results again in the discussion. No need to explain everything; just select the most significant results and arrange them in the order of importance and provide explanations</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Couple departures observed should also be explained that will further strengthen the ms. Please include the significances of your research results from contribution towards Nigerian an regional agro-economics. Explain how your results will be useful to other producing regions of west Africa.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Anonymous
Department, University & Country	Canada