



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEA_27121
Title of the Manuscript:	Influence of Moringa Seed Powder and Liquid Gold on Available Phosphorus and Potassium Pools of a P-deficient Alfisol at Samaru, 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 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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	The study is in a new way and help solve a problem of cultural practices.	Noted. Thank you.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	In the introduction, references 1, 2 and 3 are quite old and need to be supplemented with more recent literature. The study lacks a justification for the use of natural products in the correction of soil nutrients. Full scientific nomenclature of the plant should be included (genus, species, author and family). The units of measure (mg / kg etc.) should be reviewed throughout the study. The work needs greater support in the literature proposing the urine as fertilizer. The study does not describe in detail the collection, botanical identification, drying processes, crushing and storage of the powder. There is also no details of the collection of urine collection and storage time. The use of human urine does not require approval by the committee of ethics? The results must be compared with the literature and	As stated in the manuscript, the urine sample was collected from fellow students (who are not patients) and who were aware of purpose for the collection. Disinfected apparatus were used for the sample collection as well as the very short-time storage period. All other observations/suggestions are fully noted.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	discussed in depth. The phytochemicals plant compounds such as alkaloids, flavonoids etc did not influence the results? Time and storage of urine did not produce artifacts that may affect the outcome? Ethical issue: These aspects vary across countries where the studies are developed. In my view the collection of human urine requires an evaluation committee of ethics.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The work certainly contributes to the science of experimental agriculture. However, for publication no need for adjustments in the introduction, methodology and discussion.	Noted.