Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_CJAST_85127**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Effect of Integrated Use of Nitrogen and Biofertilizer on Yield of Cabbage (Brassica oleracea var. capitata L.)**
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:

(https://www.journalcjast.com/index.php/CJAST/editorial-policy)

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 ABSTRACT The experimental findings revealed that no. of days taken to 50% head maturity (65.21), no. of days taken to 100% head maturity (73.23), MATERIALS AND METHOD The experiment was laid out in Randomized Block Design with 4 levels of Nitrogen (0, 75%, 100%, and 125%) alone and in combination with 2 biofertilizers i.e. *Azotobacter* and *Azospirillum* in combination with nitrogen levels, and one is absolute control was laid out in simple RBD with three replications. The treatments were T_0 = Control, T_1= *Azotobacter*, T_2= *Azospirillum*, T_3= 75% of RDN + No Biofertilizer, T_4=75% of RDN + *Azotobacter*, T_5= 75% of RDN + *Azospirillum*, T_6= 100% of RDN + No Biofertilizer, T_7= 100% of RDN + *Azotobacter*, T_8= 100% of RDN + *Azospirillum*, T_9=125% of RDN + No Biofertilizer, T_{10}=125% of RDN + *Azotobacter* and T_{11}=125% of RDN + *Azospirillum*. Thirty days old seedlings developed from different treatments were dipped in biofertilizer solution for 15 The seedlings were ready for transplanting within five-six weeks. The observations were recorded on least significant difference at 5% level was used for finding the significant differences among the treatment means.	Authors should consider writing number rather than no. And this is applicable throughout the write-up. This statement is contradictory as such authors should recast. 4 levels of nitrogen fertilizer and 2 levels of biofertizer is making 8 + a control making 9. What about putting it as in the abstract; the experiment comprised of twelve treatments laid out in RBD replicated 3 times. The treatments were as follow; T_0 = Control, T_1= *Azotobacter*, T_2= *Azospirillum*, T_3= 75% of RDN + No Biofertilizer, T_4=75% of RDN + *Azotobacter*, T_5= 75% of RDN + *Azospirillum*, T_6= 100% of RDN + No Biofertilizer, T_7= 100% of RDN + *Azotobacter*, T_8= 100% of RDN + *Azospirillum*, T_9=125% of RDN + No Biofertilizer, T_{10}=125% of RDN + *Azotobacter* and T_{11}=125% of RDN + *Azospirillum*. These statements need to be clearly explain and reconcile. In a nutshell authors need to improve on their materials and methods. Recast	
Minor REVISION comments INTRODUCTION , and its use helps to reduce the number of inorganic nitrogen fertilizers used	Quantity/amount of fertilizer or number?	

Review Form 1.6

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)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Rakiya Abdullahi**
Department, University & Country	**University of Maiduguri, Nigeria**