



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2014_AJEA_9179
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Albizia zygia and NPK fertilizer on the Improvement of Soil Fertility and Maize yield on a Humid Alfisol, Southwestern Nigeria
Type of the 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	The manuscript AJEA-9179 reports on the effects of green manure (from the agroforestry leguminous tree <i>Albizia zygia</i>) and NPK fertilizer on soil fertility and grain maize yield. The study adopts a quite conventional, though experimentally robust randomized complete block design and presents results also in a rather conventional structure, with basic statistics to demonstrate significant differences for a fairly ample set of analyzed variables, from soil fertility (nutrient contents and physical aspects) to yield, costs and revenues. The paper merits publication but suffers from sloppy formulation, with whole phrases being (unduly) repeated already on the third sentence of the Abstract (and elsewhere), and a missing verb on the very first phrase of the Introduction. Careful revision for proper English writing is advised. Offered <i>Keywords</i> should not repeat those in the Title, and should include 'green manure, mulching'. The Introduction lacks focus on the central idea of the research, and would improve greatly by including an estimation on the area of degraded soils in the region or the country (instead of general comments on, e.g., erosion and its effects in soil degradation), the availability of AFS and consequent attainability of <i>Albizia</i> green manure; and a paragraph on 'best combined rates' for green manures and industrial fertilizers.	Corrected Corrected Included Corrected
Minor REVISION comments	Even if being a role of the editorial office, authors should try	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	to improve the desktop editing of the manuscript (see lines 68-72) and carry out a careful revision of the text, substituting, e.g., on line 101 once more - 'campus of Joseph Ayo ...' simply by 'experimental plots' – again on line 152; eliminating phrase repetition throughout (see 'water holding capacity' on line 129); checking for omissions – as in 'slightly acidic with a pH value of 5.9' on line 176, and so forth. Careful revision should eliminate meaningless statements such as (line 344) '[25] Reported that sufficient exchangeable acidity is responsible for soil acidity' – isn't this plain obvious? – Also, note a [number] in place of name citation – check and correct use of names in citations when appropriate. The formulation of separate subsections in RESULTS AND DISCUSSION makes the presentation of results idle and uninformative, a mere repetition of table contents. Anyone can see which numbers are higher, but the question should be 'are variations meaningful? Are values consistent? Are there influences from environmental conditions during growth? This is true for the entire section – instead of just repeating in text the values shown in Tables, please comment on consistency, meaning and tendencies – be informative to the reader ! Subsection 3.2.7 is matter-of-factly obvious. Please rephrase and make it meaningful – it may well be the most valuable lesson from the whole research.	Corrected Corrected Corrected This section was divided into two i.e Results and discussion, The results were discussed first and a sub-section for discussions. Adjusted
Optional/General comments		