Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Journal of Experimental Agriculture International**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JEAI_83569**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Use of various organics substrates and evolution of chemical parameters during composting of Panicum maximum jacq and Oriza stiva L. straw**
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.journaljeai.com/index.php/JEAI/editorial-policy)

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** **Correct the word STIVA, because it is incorrect** **RESULTS** **3.2. Evolution of carbon and major nutrient content** **Table 4.** To correct the space that separates the values of R2 because it is incorrect. It is marked in the manuscript **REFERENCES** Correct the pages of the references marked with red-yellow in the manuscript	
Minor REVISION comments	Material and methods **2.3. Data collected and analyzed** 1. Are you referring to the 1st, 2nd and 3rd week that the batteries were turned, or to the repetitions of each treatment? 2. Were the samples dried and packaged at the end of the experiment or at each sampling stage? marked lines in the manuscript **RESULTS** **3.1. Evolution of pH-water, Ca and Mg levels during composting** The difference of one pH unit in treatment T2 is significant, but not for treatment 1, which only changed from 8.25 to 8.14? and could be due to an experimental error. **Table 3. Variation of pH, Ca and Mg during composting** Why is there no difference here and in R3 with 0.01 if there is? **DISCUSSION** 1. I do not believe that the decrease of only 0.08 pH units is due to the production of acids, since these generally lower the pH to values close to 6. I believe that it could be due to a measurement error.. 2. They say it decreased not that there was an increase, so what does ammonia have to do with it? 3. Like which polymers? They must discuss better these results	
Optional/General comments	**RESULTS** **3.1. Evolution of pH-water, Ca and Mg levels during composting** Why didn't they measure these parameters for each of the mixtures at the beginning of composting, in order to calculate the efficiency of each of the treatments? **CONCLUSION** It is important to carry out toxicity bioassays to know which of the composts was better, given that sometimes the soil of the fields is irrigated with synthetic fertilizers.	

Review Form 1.6

PART 2:

	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)*
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Florina Ramirez Vives**
Department, University & Country	**Metropolitan Autonomous University, México**