



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_59268
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of organic and mineral fertilizers on the growth and production parameters of maize (Zea mays L.) at Djalingo in the north region of Cameroon
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/journal/10/editorial-policy>)



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	<p>The article is good. It can be published but after making more and important corrections and adding some suggestions.</p> <p>1- Statistical analysis should not be mentioned in the abstract</p> <p>2- There are many references recorded in text with the numerical There are researches (the names of authors) mentioned in the research with the order numbers such as Macauley and Ramadjita [2],Khan et al [8][13],Adams et al [11] ,Abd El-Gawad and Morsy [12] ,Baghdadi et al 16] and Bahtt et al [22]act</p> <p>1- In the results, it is necessary to enter directly on the results from the table and without introductions on mentioning germination and places of cultivation again, as there is no need to mention numbers and signs of significance again as they are already repeated in the table, there is no need to repeat them. Please do that in all paper text (my opinion). It is possible to place the Fig 1 (noose stem diameter) in table (1) with the rest of the parameters , or make one form for all the parameters together and cancel the Tables , as well as the parameters in Fig 2 put it in Table 3</p> <p>2- There is mistake in this reference in text was wrote Jjagme et al [2020] The correct is [20]</p> <p>3- Under title Experimental design and crop treatments Please correct the treatment (mineral fitilizer) to T2 no T1 because T1 is a control treatment((T1)</p> <p>5- References have to arrange by alphabetical order or numerical order So have to mentioned no or write the name of author in text if you choose the numerical way</p> <p>6- Delete word (accompanied) from conclusion Delete repeated word (treatment) in conclusion</p>	<p>1. Statistical analysis was removed from the abstract as suggested</p> <p>2. references in the text were corrected as suggested (see main manuscript)</p> <p>RESULTS</p> <p>1. Germination rate was removed as suggested</p> <p>- Places of cultivation removed and suggested</p> <p>- noose stem diameter was evaluated in 2 periods 14 and 21 only while data from number of plant leaves and plant heights were recorded after 14, 21, 28 and 35 days viz 2, 3 4 and 5 weeks. Difference in period time makes it difficult to put them together. And I choose graph to balance the use of table and fig in the manuscript</p> <p>2. Reference corrected</p> <p>3. mistake corrected</p> <p>5. Names of authors in the text were removed to remain only the numbers as suggested</p> <p>Words "accompagnied: and "treatment" repeated are removed</p>
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General 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)	