



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advances in Agricultural Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAAR_37677
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECT OF POULTRY MANURE AND UREA ON SOIL CHEMICAL PROPERTIES, NODULATION AND YIELD OF GROUNDNUT (Arachis hypogaea) IN AKANU IBIAM FEDERAL POLYTECHNIC, UNWANA AFIKPO EBONYI STATE
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>)

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	Urea rates is very high and uncommon. So that, it should be mention in the literature site, why the urea rate is very high. Conclusion is too general. This is pot experiment, so that make conclusion as your finding	
Minor REVISION comments	Line 14: Results should ... it should be "Results showed" Line 87: Pot experience it should be "Pot Experiment" Line 115: Steel and Terrie ... it should be "Steel and Torrie" Line 140: soil pH is acidic. Line 146: Ca is high ... please explain, why soil pH low but Ca is high. Line 173: Cmol1/kg?? What its mean "1" in this units Line 174: in table 3 (and also other tables), use "0+0" instead of "control" because this is interaction table Line 185-187 in Table 3: probalility number that more than 0.05 should be mark as "NS" Line 197: statement of " ... the lone application of urea was only significant in influencing the P_H, P, C, N" ... based on Table 3, there is no significant effect of Urea on P and C Line 198-199: the statement in this two line are not true, because the interaction effect is not sigtificant to P, C, ECEC and BS	Changes in line 14, 87 and 115 have been effected. For lines 140 and 146: My observation may be correct because, even though calcium plays much role in soil alkalinity, but it is not the only element that causes soil alkalinity. Other cations like sodium, magnesium and even potassium also induce soil alkalinity. Calcium was relatively high in this study, but the other cations were low. That may be the reason why the soil was acidic. Line 173: the unit is cmol/kg. Line 174: Changes effected. Line 185-187: The probability number 0.05 as used in all Tables means that if the experiment is repeated 100 times, errors might only occur in 5 of the trials and therefore it is not a benchmark or critical value for comparing means. Line 198-199: The corrections have been effected.
Optional/General comments	The experiment was RCB two factors. So that, the tables conctructed should be two ways tables. The table do not show mean effect, but interaction effect In all tables: the term of F-LSD (0.005) in my understanding is probability, but if you mean that F-LSD (0.05) is critical value for camparition, it is better to use LSD (0.05) rather than F-LSD (0.05) Table 4 will be better if it is presented as graph	The experiment was a Green House experiment and therefore the design should be CRD. Table 4 has been presented in a bar chart