

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommend as part of the revision.

ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name:	Email:
Date Manuscript Received: 31/01/2017	Date Manuscript Review Submitted: 07/02/2017
Manuscript Title: Potassium Recovery Potential Of Selected Agro-Forestry Wastes In Ibadan, Nigeria.	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0528/17	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a brief explanation for each 3-less point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	4
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable) The title of the manuscript is self explanatory and a pointer to the broad theme studied.</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> The abstract should be modified to explain in brevity the importance of Pottassium to warrant its economic exctracts.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> Some of the long sentences could be shortened without lossing their meanings. Besides concise presentations of fact willpromote understanding by the journal audience	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> The methods of analysis are well detailed inthe manuscript.	

5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	4
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> <i>Yes, though the body of the paper is clear; however, some statements and paragraph were clumsy and difficult to decipher. I will suggest a language review to promote brevity and comprehension by the Journal's audience</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> The conclusion summarizes the study findings correctly	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> <i>The references are comprehensive and appropriate to the study</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revisions needed	X
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

- The study explored a neglected waste to wealth initiative, which of course could be explored to promote sustainable development in a developing economy using appropriate technology.
- The introductory paragraph of the abstract should be improved to justify the economy and use **Potassium** and to inform the Journal's audience why the study is of utmost importance to readers
- The ease of flow through language editing of the manuscript should be reviewed to promote easy comprehension by the Journal's audience.

- The number of samples (n) in Tables 1, Table 2, Table 3 and Table 4 should be indicated.
- The arrangement of Bars in Figure 3 should be in order of magnitude

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

- The manuscript presents a waste to wealth initiative that could be explored to reduce waste and promote wealth among the people. The paper uses a scientific examination, using standard methods to identify the proportion of waste that could be recovered in an economic manner, which is commendable.
- The language editing of the manuscript is recommended to promote easy flow of ideas to the Journals audience.
- The number of samples (n) in Tables 1, Table 2, Table 3 and Table 4 should be indicated.
- The arrangement of Bars in Figure 3 should be in order of magnitude