



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_36722
Title of the Manuscript:	MAIZE VARIETAL RESPONSE TO INTEGRATED NUTRIENT MANAGEMENT OF NPK AND CHICKEN MANURE
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 (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	1. Title: Modify the title to read MAIZE VARIETY RESPONSE TO NPK AND CHICKEN MANURE AMENDMENTS 2. LINE 8: DELETE the phrase design used from the sentence. 3. line 22. Delete chicken manure from the key words. 4. line 18: Change practice to practise. 5. line 48: Change play to plays 6. line 65: Bsdiese series with a pH range of 4 – 6.5. Why such a wide range. You cultivate the top soil so quote the pH of the top soil. 7. lines 70 to 77 is a repetition information in Table 1 so delete the lines and keep the Table 1. 8. lines 98 – 102: Give more details on the methodology (e.g. how was the manure is digested) You determined soil pH in water and 0.01M and you reported on one. Give reference for Walkley Black method and the Kjeldahl method. Give a little detail on Bray's method (Bray 1 or Bray 2?) How did you extract the exchangeable cations? 9. line 107: Note research institute should be change to Research Institute. 10. line 109: Recommended NPK (65:38:38) BUT ½ NPK (33:19:19) Note 33 is not ½ of 65. 11. line 126 – 127: Modify DATA ANALYSIS WAS DONE USING ANOVA AND to READ DATA WERE SUBJECTED TO ANOVA USING 12. Table 4	- Title of article has been modified Used from the sentence in line 8 deleted Chicken manure deleted Practice has been changed to practise Play has been changed to plays - The pH of the top soil quoted - Information on Table I has been deleted and the table maintained - More details has been given on the methodology for lines 98 to 102 - References for Walkley Black and Kjeldahl methods given. Details on Bray's method and how exchangeable cations was extracted has been provided. - Research institute changed to Research Institute ½ Recommended NPK (65:38:38) changed from (33: 19:19) to (32.5: 19:19) - Line 126 to 127 modified to data were subjected to ANOVA using..... - Row labelled value deleted and untreated soil changed to unamended soil - Unit of cmol/ kg modified to cmol_c kg⁻¹ - Legend on Figures 1,2 and 3 has been modified and all figures placed in 1 page. - Discussion has been reduced and corrections done Most references have been updated to at least



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Delete row labelled value and change untreated soil to unamended soil. Note the unit of charge is written either as $\text{cmol}_c \text{kg}^{-1}$. Or $\text{cmol}(+)/\text{kg}$. 13. Figures 1, 2 and. Author must note the paper will be printed in black and white so the legend must be chosen carefully.. Place all the four figures on one page. DISCUSSION: This section too long and is full of repetitions.(see scanned copy of discussion for comment and suggestions). REFERENCES: REFERENCES ARE TOO OLD FOR A PAPER TO BE PUBLISHED IN 2017. Update them to at least 2011..	2011 and beyond
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		