



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Agriculture and Ecology Research International
Manuscript Number:	2015_JAERI_17248
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of processed feather waste as mulch on crop growth and soil fertilization
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>Title:</u> - Title is accurately described the content of the paper. <u>Abstract:</u> - The "Abstract" section stated the principal objectives and summarized the results obtained and principal conclusions. <u>Introduction:</u> - In this section the author(s) describe clearly the main issue of the study. It also includes the aim of the work. <u>Materials & methods:</u> - Description of experimental design was made clearly. <u>Results:</u> Line 208-214: Under subtitle "Average weight of chicken": The author(s) should avoid the repetition of sentences in describing the results in the text. Line 255 & 275: Fig 5 & 6: No indication about the Unit (cm) in the X-axis label in both Fig. 5 & Fig 6.	Repeated statements under subtitle 'Average weight of chicken' have been restructured. Figure 5 and 6 are now Figure 4 and 5. The graphs have been reconstructed and



SDI Review Form 1.6

	There is a repetition between the data in Table 3 and Fig 4, the author(s) should select one of them in the revised manuscript. Line 240-246: The data reported in these lines do not match with the corresponding data presented in Fig.5. Line 248-254: The data reported in these lines do not match with the corresponding data presented in Fig 6. <u>Discussion:</u> • Line 278: “The mean weight of a broiler chicken was more or less the same as that of the layer” instead of “The mean weight of a broiler chicken was higher than that of the layer” (see Table 3). • In the “Discussion” section, the results obtained should be discussed with the corresponding results (or closely related results) reported by other investigators supported by the corresponding references. In addition the authors should avoid repetition of the results previously mentioned in the “Results” section. <u>References:</u> • Line 433: Uponi, J.J. and Adeoye, G.O. (2000), “Soil testing, and plant analysis: an overview”. In: Akoroda, M.O.	properly labelled. The data reported in these graphs lines are now in consonance with the data presented. The state has been recast. The references have been amended.
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	(ed.) Agronomy in Nigeria, Department of Agronomy, University of Ibadan, pp. 174-182. • Line 427, 428: Korean Journal of Food Preservation 20(3), 435- 439. • Line 403: “<i>Bacillus licheniformis</i>” instead of “<i>Bacillus icheniforms</i>”.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		We appreciate the corrections made to improve the quality of the manuscript.