



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_52869
Title of the Manuscript:	Growth response of cocoa (Theobroma cacao L.) seedlings to application of cocoa pod husk-based compost
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	<p>1) Methodology: Authors did not specify their experimental design, how many replications, how many samples per replicate?.</p> <p>2) Methodology: Authors did not write connection between interaction of two factors (compost types and compost soil mixture), what are the connection?. These lead to cause confusion.</p> <p>3) Methodology: standard foliar fertilizer, what is it?. Authors should specify the used fertilizer formular, how to fertilizer, how much fertilizer, fertilizer frequency.</p> <p>4) Table 5: the data showed only compost types and compost-soil ratio, but the results of interaction of these two factors are missing.</p> <p>5) Table 5: Authors should fill the alphabet after each value in order to show the significant difference. But the results in Table 5 showed only average value.</p> <p>6) Dry matter: Authors should not separate their results as Fig 1, because that might just make no difference.</p> <p>7) Table 6: Authors should fill the alphabet after each value in order to show the significant difference. But the results in Table 6 showed only average value.</p> <p>8) Table 6: The results in Table were incomplete contents. They lack of the results of both compost-soil ratio and interaction of compost and compost-soil ratio.</p> <p>9) Table 7: Authors should fill the alphabet after each value in order to show the significant difference. But the results in Table 6 showed only average value.</p> <p>10) Table 7: The results in Table were incomplete contents. They lack of the results of interaction of compost and compost-soil ratio.</p> <p>11) Table 8: Authors should fill the alphabet after each value in order to show the significant difference. But the results in Table 6 showed only average value.</p> <p>12) Table 8: The results in Table were incomplete contents. They lack of the results of interaction of compost and compost-soil ratio.</p> <p>13) Fig 4: Authors should fill Y-axis and their units.</p> <p>14) Discussion: Authors should add their discussion why CMPT1 mixed with surface soil at the ratio of 1:3 is the optimal soil recommended for cocoa seedlings?</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>1) Line 514: This reference lack of page number.</p> <p>2) Line 564: 124–125; 128-130. Please check the accuracy of page number.</p>	
Optional/General comments	-	

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Benjawan Chutichudet
Department, University & Country	Maharakham University, Thailand