



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>Journal of Agriculture and Ecology Research International</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAERI_20297
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Municipal Solid Waste Slurry (MSW) of Biogas Plant on Soil Parameters and Yield of Spinach
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	Title: modified to either "Effect of Municipal Solid Waste Slurry (MSW) ~~of Biogas Plant~~ on Soil Parameters and Yield of Spinach". Or, "Effect of Municipal Solid Waste Slurry (MSW) ~~of from~~ Biogas Plant, on Soil Parameters and Yield of Spinach (<i>Spinacia oleracea</i> L.)". State the botanical name of text crop in bracket as indicated. Abstract: remove subtitles. Remove the phrase "above recommended dose" and replace it with the appropriate treatment. Introduction: replace the word "Its agriculture" with "Her agriculture". Objective (S): not clearly stated in the paper. Recommendation: not stated. Reference: More (1994) in line 133 was not referenced in reference section.	Title corrected Removed Corrected Stated Corrected
Minor REVISION comments	Table 2: available sulphur, correct to sulphur. Include other values of other micronutrients (Cu, Mn, Fe, etc.). State the proper and conventional units for P, S, Zn etc. Line 141: correct 'For sowing small' to Before sowing, small... Line 144: start the last sentence with a capital letter (Immediately). Line 153: watering-can Line 158: why was the harvesting done at 38 DAS? That is less than 6 WAP. Any justification? Line 207: what do you mean by yield and yield	Done Done Done Done Done Done



SDI Review Form 1.6

	component? Mention them one by one to also include water content of plant. Line 210: yield (kg plot⁻¹) and total yield (t ha⁻¹). Table 3: was there no significance among the treatments in org matter and soil temperature? If not state so and if there are indicate. Table 4: same as in table 3 for photosynthesis rates. Table 4: what constituted the yield per plot (stem, leaf, root, and fruit)? Economic or biological yield? The data is not clearly define. Lines 319-330: there are no bases for comparison here, due to differences in text crops. Look for similar crops and compare. Why was the dry matter and nutrient content of the plant not determined? There is need to determine the uptake to ascertain the ability of this plant to effectively harness some metals from the MSW as fertilizer, to effectively justify your concluding report. Furthermore, you've to carried out tissue (nutrients) analysis and determine dry matter yield with respect to the treatments to determine nutrient concentration and uptake to bring out the beauty of the study. Growth rate alone does not constitute any contribution to academic knowledge. The beauty of eating maize is in the nutrient values and not how the plants grow.	Done There is no significant difference There is no significant difference Total yield per plot represent biological yield Comparison is difficult due to lack of sufficient data with spinach Proper facility to perform these was not available
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The paper is very interesting and publishable. Manuscript is accepted but requires further work to do on the manuscript before publication.	