



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

|                          |                                                                                                                                                                       |
|--------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Journal Name:            | <a href="#">American Journal of Experimental Agriculture</a>                                                                                                          |
| Manuscript Number:       | Ms_AJEA_20145                                                                                                                                                         |
| Title of the Manuscript: | IMPACT OF CROPPING RATIOS OF MAIZE (zea mays)-EGUSI MELON (colocynthis citrullus) AND NPK FERTILIZER ON SOIL PRODUCTIVITY RATING OF AN ULTISOL IN EDO STATE, 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) |
|--------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments | The study was conducted in a professional manner and it is very relevant to the needs of farmers. However there are some sections that need to be modified in order for the manuscript to be of good quality and attain a high standard. The materials and methods section, as well as discussion sections need a major serious revision. The author did not clearly explain the meaning of the ratios that were used e.g. 1:3, 3:1, 1:1 etc. These ratios must be clearly explained so that the end-user of this information have a better understanding. The discussion section is rather weak with author repeating the result rather than explaining all the possible reasons behind the results. |                                                                                                                                                                               |
| <b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments      |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |                                                                                                                                                                               |
| <b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments    | My final suggestions are that the manuscript be sent back to the author for some form of corrections and modifications of certain sections and do the necessary corrections as highlighted on the attached text.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |                                                                                                                                                                               |

**Reviewer Details:**

|                                  |                     |
|----------------------------------|---------------------|
| Name:                            | <b>Anonymous</b>    |
| Department, University & Country | <b>South Africa</b> |