



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEA_25308
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Biosoil conditioner and NPK 15:15:15 fertilizers on the growth and yield of Maize (Zea mays L.) in North- Central of 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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	I have carefully read the research article entitled "Effect of Biosoil conditioner and NPK 15:15:15 fertilizers on the growth and yield of Maize (Zea mays L.) in North-Central of Nigeria" and concluded that the author?authors needs to do serious review of article. In my opinion, it is written with lack of care. Many REFERENCES are missing as well as GRAPHS are quite patchy. TABLES are not properly labeled. No METHODOLOGY with reference is mentioned which were used to examine different physio-chemical attributes. And most important thing author forgot to do is DISCUSSION on results that is one of main parts of a research article. CONCLUSIONS are quite confusing, as no nutrient content is given while whole research was to optimize the growth my providing N, P and K to plants. I strongly suggest regarding rewriting of article with great care so that all of these deficiencies can be overcome	- The missing references in the text have been corrected. - The missing word absolute in the graph has been included. - Clarification on data collection in the methodology has been included - The discussion and result of each parameter have been elaborated further - The conclusion part of the article has been arranged as well (check line 286 – 292)
Minor REVISION comments	- Citation in text is present (Welch, 1995; Griller, 1966; FMANR, 1990) but in bibliography is not mentioned. - In line No. 10 do not repeat the same word again and again like "APPLICATION". - In line No. 15 given treatment T4 to control as it is part of experimental treatment. - In line No. 23, 30 do not use the word respectively	This has been taken care in the articles. - They have been included - Application has been removed - T4 has been added to control - It has been corrected - Sentence in No 31,37 rewritten - Line 48, and is included



SDI Review Form 1.6

	as all the values are expressed after parameters. 5. In line No. 26 round off the least value as highest value is also not mentioned in fraction. 6. Improve the sentence in line No. 31, 37. 7. In line No. 48 use N, P and K instead of N, P, K. 8. In line No. 50 use term micronutrients as it represent all the micro essential elements not a single one. 9. In line No. 62 do not use words like scarcity as mostly fertilizer become unavailable due to monopoly or black marketing to get maximum profit? 10. In line No. 63 what do you mean by "On thus". 11. In line No. 72 what do you mean by Nitrogen mobilization by microbes while mostly nitrogen fertilizers are lost due their mobility as volatilization and leaching? Most of microbes (nitrogen fixing bacteria) play role in soil fertility by fixing the atmospheric nitrogen. 12. In line No. 76 you have mention application of organic what you want to convey either organic matter or organic pollutant? It's quite confusing. 13. In line No. 127 what is WPA (please mention complete name 1st with abbreviation and after that	7. It has been taken care in line 50 8. Line 62, the scarcity has been replaced with another word unavailability 9. Line 50, micronutrient is used 10. Line 72, it has been corrected not mobilization but fixation 11. Line 76, it organic manure or matter not pollutant 12. It is WAP (weeks after planting) it has been included 13. It is not necessary to state all the methods used to determine soil analysis in the article because it is a standard known by all soil fertility experts 14. Line 127, it has been corrected and highlighted 15. Line 230, FCTADP is removed 16. Conclusion has been rewritten
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	you can use abbreviation). 14. Please mention all the methods with references which you have used to determine soil and plants analysis. 15. In line No. 127 mention the complete title of table 2. 16. Modify all the graphs as these are not technically sound by mentioning standard bar errors, probability level, filling pattern and justify all lines. 17. Justify all the line to align the text at left and right side corner. 18. In line No. 230 use abbreviate FCTADP by initially mentioning the complete term. 19. Conclusion is quite patchy and confusing. As author unable to understand how 300 kg NPK/ha application cost will become low while it is not optimizing yield. It seems that additional bio soil conditioner cost also included in the fertilizer cost as 300 kg NPK/ha is used in all the treatments equally except control. 20. Why didn't you discuss any parameters with some logical justification of your results? 21. Results are also very patchy please mention the percent increase or decrease the yield. 22. Please give some data regarding the nutrients	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	uptake in plants to examine their role in enhancing the growth attributes.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		