



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_29016
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Urine Sources on Some Soil Health indicators, Maize yield and Its Heavy Metals Uptake in Abakaliki, Southeastern 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 (<i>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</i>)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - This work can be considered a previous experiment to a real investigation. A serious research work should be based on a study with two or three different samples of soil texture and composition. It must also contain two or three different levels of fertilization. There is an error in the design of the experiment. - The author tries to compare animal urine with mineral fertilization. You can not compare a level of 100LNha-1 of organic fertilizer with 0LNha-1, but with 100LNha-1 of mineral fertilizer. - The author does not indicate the criteria for picking the urine of these animals from other like sheep, cows, pigs, etc. - The author also shows how the three urine samples from different animals are analytically almost equal. - Table 1- If used urine samples do not contain urea or ammonia, total nitrogen must be in the form of nitrate. This parameter should have analyzed - Table 2- Fertilization increases the level of soil salts. Soil 	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>salinity before and after treatment should have been studied</p> <p>-Table 3-</p> <p>- The significant differences between treatments should be indicated with different letters. It should be noted the range of error or to present the results as graphs</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	<p>All results are predictable without having done this experiment, including the washing metals is greater in the control due to its lower salt content</p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Manuel Jimenez Aguilar</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Ecological Agriculture and Natural Resources, Agricultural and Development Research Institute, (Granada), Spain</i>