



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Crop Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCS_40863
Title of the Manuscript:	Nitrogen Use Efficiency in Maize (<i>Zea mays</i> L.) as Affected by Rates of Nitrogen Fertilizer Application on Different Soil Types in Yola, Adamawa State, Nigeria
New title of the Manuscript:	Nitrogen Use Efficiency in Maize (<i>Zea mays</i> L.) as Affected by Rates of Nitrogen Fertilizer Application on Different Soil Types in Yola, Adamawa State, Nigeria
Type of Article:	Original Research Article

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
Line 122: What is the sign found between T_1 and T_2 in the equation? Is it multiplication, addition or subtraction sign?	Corrected
Line 126: ".. in each fraction" This is not clear. Which fraction is being referred to? Is it "each fraction" or "each plot"? "Product of nitrogen concentration" Mathematically, a product is got by multiplying two values? Which ones are you referring to in this statement?	Means each plant used that constituted the total of each treatment Product means result, not its mathematical meaning
Line 131: Growth and yield parameters that were measured should be given. Describe how measurement of each parameter was done. This is to enable another researcher who wish to repeat this experiment to be guided exactly what to do.	Effects of Nitrogen Fertilizer Rates and Soil Types on Yield and Yield Components of Maize (<i>Zea mays</i> L.) in Yola, Adamawa State, Nigeria J. B. Abakura and I. Audu <i>Asian Journal of Agricultural and Horticultural Research</i> 1(1): 1-12, 2018; Article no.AJAHR.39488
Line 151: At what level of significance were the mean values considered significantly different? I have inserted changes in the manuscript by assuming that LSD was 5%, and thus $LSD_{(0.05)}$. But adjust to the correct one, for example 1% if my assumption is wrong.	0.05 and 0.01 level of significance were considered
Line 154: In your methodology (Sections 2.3 and 2.4 above), the soil samples were analyzed for nitrogen ONLY. Then where or how did you get data for bulk density, particle density and soil water content presented in Table 1? These other parameters need to be described in the methodology. You commented that, "Some of the pointed suggestions have already been published by the authors in another separate publication" If you are referring to information, such as missing here, note that in principle, each publication stands independent of others. You cannot present results for which you have not given the methodology.	A little mix up. deleted
Line 173: Seasonal differences in "nitrogen accumulation per plant" are not shown in the results presented in Table 2. For example, in which season was nitrogen accumulation higher or lower than the other seasons? According to the results in Table 2, the results for each season are completely independent of other seasons. If season was also considered in the analysis, then the author would have presented a "2-way table" with a column of another set of LSD values on the right hand side of the table.	The topic focuses on nitrogen use efficiency which other reviewers acknowledged except otherwise
Lines 183-190: There are no significant differences between all treatments in 2011 and also in 2012. So, this highlighted section needs to be corrected. In research, even if one value is higher or lower than the other, and the two are not statistically (significantly) different, they are taken to be similar (not different from each other). When describing such results, we do not even mention the values. In the table of results, an abbreviation (ns) is	Seasonal differences in "nitrogen accumulation per plant" was not considered. Noted for future research Significant differences were considered between the three seasons. Consider again; there are significant differences in the points you highlighted
	Slightly modified section 2 to suit the journal format, your suggestions and that of other reviewers



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

<p>written instead of LSD values (unless if it is the style of the journal to include LSD values of non-significant treatment means).</p> <p>Lines 196-199: According to LSD values given in Table 3. All the treatment means for various seasons are non-significant. Carefully look at values presented in Table 3. The description that follows (Lines 200-219) is dependent on what is presented in lines 196-199, and therefore all requires adjustment.</p> <p>Other corrections to be made are highlighted in the manuscript.</p>	
--	--