



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Research in Crop Science</a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJRCS_40863</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>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</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

**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 REVISION</u> comments</b>	<p><b>Lines 93 to 96</b> (Sub-section 2.3) should be merged with Sub-section 2.2.</p> <p><b>Lines 102 to Line 130</b> (Sub-sections 2.5 and 2.6) should be merged with Sub-section 2.1 just as a continuation after line 80.</p> <p><b>Lines 132 - 133.</b> Growth and yield parameters that were measured should be given. Also, a description of how each was measured is needed. Growth parameters of maize plants include plant height, number of leaves, days to anthesis, days to flowering, anthesis-silking interval, etc. Yield parameters include number of cobs per plant, cob length, number of kernel rows per cob, grain weight per cob, weight of 1000 grains, biological yield, and grain yield per unit land area. So, of all these parameters, which ones were measured?</p> <p><b>Line 171:</b> Table 1 is supposed to be part of the methodology because there is no objective of the study that was supposed TO DETERMINE THE CHEMICAL AND PHYSICAL PROPERTIES / COMPOSITION OF THE SOILS AT THE EXPERIMENTAL SITES. Table 1 can be transferred to sub-section 2.1 under materials and methods to show the characteristics of soils at experimental sites but should not be discussed. If this table is to remain to where it is (under Results' section) and its contents (variables) described and discussed (Lines 157 to 170), the variables it contains MUST BE SUBJECTED TO ANOVA AND SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES SHOWN instead of stating that "this value was higher than that one" yet the two values are not significantly different.</p> <p><b>Line 153 – 154:</b> The level of significance was not stated. For most experimental work related to this one, differences between means are considered significant at 5% (<math>P &lt; 0.05</math>). This was not stated. However, in Tables 2, 3, 4 and 5 it seems the level of significance was taken as <math>P &lt; 0.01</math> (which is high). At this high level of significance, means that would be significantly different at <math>P &lt; 0.05</math> become non-significant. So, taking into consideration of Least Significant Difference (LSD) values given by the author in these tables, the mean values which the author claims to be significantly different ARE NOT SIGNIFICANTLY DIFFERENT. This rendered THE DESCRIPTIONS GIVEN ABOUT THESE TABLES NOT TO MARCH WITH CONTENTS (VALUES) IN TABLES. The author needs to work on this first and then re-write the description of results in these tables.</p>	<p>Thank you Some of the pointed suggestions have already been published by the authors in another separate publication Which ones do you mean by some? In principle, each publication stands independent of others.</p> <p>All necessary corrections are effected Thank you You did not give anything about growth and yield parameters in your revised draft.</p>
<b><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</b>	Minor corrections are highlighted yellow within the manuscript. Most of them are typing errors.	
<b><u>Optional/General</u> comments</b>	Using the Least Significant Difference (LSD) to show the level of significance between mean values was not done properly hence affecting the results section of the manuscript. For example, using least significant difference to distinguish between mean values, and indicating mean values that are different or similar using superscripts was not done. For this reason, even where there is no significant difference, the write up states that it is there. See the highlighted values in the tables.	This comment was not taken care of and is still seriously affecting the quality of the manuscript.

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<b>Anonymous Reviewer, Reviewer preferred to be anonymous.</b>
-------	--



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Department, University & Country	
----------------------------------	--