



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2014_AJEA_12254
Title of the Manuscript:	Nitrogen (N) and Phosphorus (P) Fertilizer Application on Maize (Zea mays L.) Growth and Yield Performance at Ado-Ekiti, Southwest Nigeria
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 comments (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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<u>Conflicts of statistical interpretation</u> In this study, interaction between N & P (N×P) was significant (line 192). Prior to presenting results of interaction, main effects P and N were introduced, especially for yield 100GW. Technically, you cannot conclude on main effects, once an interaction is significant. Hence, two last columns of Table 03 is not valid, possible main effects were not possible to isolate. Results should be linked to table 04 only. Section 3.4 & 3.5 need substantial revision. With above revision, a correlation table may be essential to isolate the impact of N&P for growth, components and yield. Strongly suggest a correlation analysis between measured parameters, based on treatment combinations.	I agree that one cannot conclude on main effect when the interaction effect is significant. I don't think it will be necessary to worry about the correlation since judgement could be based on the interaction effect, I was able to infer from Table 4 the treatment that gave the highest yield which is what the farmers are interested.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1. Table were not adequately referred in text. 2. Presentation of probability values in different ways, in text. eg. Line 15, 18 192, 149. If possible give exact probability rather than illustrating it as in the text. 3. Some references were quoted in text in different formats, e.g. 125, 129, 171, 111,	1. All Tables has been indicated and refer to in the text. 2. Probability values has been corrected 3. References have been quoted correctly.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Better to have an input from a English text editor	Thanks for the error correction