



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Economics, Management and Trade
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEMT_44157
Title of the Manuscript:	PROFITABILITY OF NITROGEN AND PHOSPHORUS FERTILIZER MICRO-DOSES ON MAIZE PRODUCTION IN SUB-HUMID FARMING SYSTEMS OF TANZANIA
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>)

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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Researcher need to clarify research design from abstract It is not clear what was involved in control, is this existing farmer practice or no fertilizer application. Method of analysis for comparison of alternative technologies against existing practices is partial budgeting not gross margins.	Research design is clarified from abstract as highlighted with yellow Control in this study has been clarified as farmers do not apply fertilizer Both gross margin and partial budgeting are used in profitability analysis. However, gross margin helps to decide whether a potential improvement is worth implementing, or whether one option is better than another option (https://www.agric.wa.gov.au/improvement-tools-gross-margin-analysis). It was chosen from this study because of different types of fertilizers and different rates (micro-doses) that are compared to find the best option.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Editorial issues highlighted in the text	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	