

**Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Soil Science and Plant Nutrition</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJSSPN_88379
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Organic Manures and Mineral Fertilizers on Soil Properties and Yield of Sweet Pepper (Capsicum annuum L.)
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:

(<https://www.journalajsspn.com/index.php/AJSSPN/editorial-policy> )

**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)
<b><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments	<p><b>The abstract needs to be improved according to the suggestion made within the manuscript.</b></p> <p><b>The author wrote this:”</b> It has been revealed in literatures that combine application of organic and inorganic fertilizers has significant positive effect on different vegetable crops [20] including sweet pepper [21]. “<b>. Surprisingly, he is working on this:” Effect of Organic Manures and Mineral Fertilizers on Soil Properties and Yield of Sweet Pepper (Capsicum annuum L.)”</b>. I am the questioning myself about the originality of the study.</p> <p><b>The structuring of sentences is sometimes questionable. The author must correct the way he insert the the authors into his text. I suggest this to him for instance: instead of write like this:”</b> Pariari and khan [35] showed that average number of branches per plant (<i>Capsicum annuum</i> L.)....” I suggest this:” working in the same field, [35] showed that.....”</p> <p>The author is mixing the authors names cited with digits. In fact, he must use only digits within the text as he started and then, within the reference section, the name of the given authors in front of the different digits.</p> <p>Too much repetition within the .results and discussions section.</p> <p>The manuscript need to be entirely revised.</p> <p><b>From my personal experience, when you have a result, you first of all present it with reference to figures or/and tables if possible. After this, you analyze the results in relation to themselves first, then in relation to the other results obtained in the same field by other researchers that you will cite. At the end, you try an interpretation to justify the result obtained. While doing so, you can create links when possible between your personal results.</b></p>	
<b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments		
<b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments		

[Review Form 1.6](#)

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer’s comment</b>	<b>Author’s comment</b> <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>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Fopoussi Tuebue Jean Christophe</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Jesus and Mary Secondary High School, Cameroon</b>