

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Agriculture and Ecology Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAERI_110684
Title of the Manuscript:	ASSESSMENT OF SOIL FERTILITY STATUS IN SELECTED FIELDS UNDER MAIZE PRODUCTION IN KONGWA DISTRICT, DODOMA REGION, TANZANIA
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	 1. Yes, I hope that maize yield in the research zone is vital for the community and should be increased by fertilizer application. As a result, assessing soil fertility is critical for increasing and maintaining community food security. 2. Yes, it is an interesting title. 3. Yes, it is lengthy, but you should rewrite and double-check the phrases and grammar, not only the abstract; all manuscripts should be revised and thoroughly reviewed. 4. Yes, the manuscript's layout is well-organized. 5. No, the manuscript should be discussed in greater depth; for example, the conclusion and recommendations sections are insufficient to summarize the manuscript in a single paragraph. As a result, you should include a discussion in the result and discussion section. 6. Yes, it is sufficient and dated	Ok Noted
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	No, you should revise again.	Noted
Optional/General comments	The manuscript's title is intriguing, but the results and discussion sections are not examined further, nor is the suggestion conclusion section. So, based on the outcome, continue the discussion.	

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?	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	