

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_85463
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECT OF NITROGEN LEVELS ON THE GROWTH AND YIELD OF SPRING MAIZE
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.journaljeai.com/index.php/JEAI/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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<p>In the abstract, the goal of your research must be seen. You cannot just wake up and start making field tests; you must have observed something frequently that you would like to understand.</p> <p>The introduction needs to be rearranged according to the remarks I did within the manuscript.</p> <p>Concerning the section dealing with the methodology, I suggest to the Author to characterize the landscape where the study was done. For this purpose, he must insist on the pedological, human activities, agricultural practises, vegetation, climatic,... aspects. This done, I suggest him to say if the work was done both on the field and in the laboratory, or only in the field, or only in the laboratory... According to where the study would have been done, I suggest him to detail how he proceeded. By doing so, I think that he would highly improve the quality of this section.</p> <p>In the section dealing with Results and Discussions, the Author needs to improve the structuring of the sentences, favouring at the same time short sentences. This will surely make easier the understanding of his manuscript. The results can be better commented. The discussion of the results must be done. Also, the title of figures are written under the figure.</p> <p>Moreover, I don't think that the name of the authors cited must appear in the text; the use of numbers can be done for that purpose. Then in the references, those numbers can be respectively associated with the author indexed. This will have the advantage to lighten the manuscript.</p> <p>I finally have the impression that the present manuscript was written with too much precipitation, with as for consequences the shortcomings observed. I advice the author to come down and reconsider it deeply because the results he obtained are interesting according to my way of seeing things.</p> <p>I have nothing to say about the references.</p> <p>NB: *In the results and discussion part, one may gainfully start by presenting a given result with reference to figures or/and tables if possible. After this, its analysis must be done in relation to itself first, then in relation to the other results obtained in the same field by other researchers to be cited. At the end, an interpretation is done in order to justify the result obtained. While doing this, links can be created when possible between one's results; for instance: the concentration of nitrogen in soils is consistent with the plant firmness</p> <p>*Furthermore, The results and discussion part of a manuscript represents the contribution of the author in the improvement of the scientific knowledge in a given field. You have pertinent results. However, the way they are presented is really questionable. I suggest you to reorganize them, properly discuss and interpret them.</p> <p>The conclusion needs to be reorganized and rephrased.</p>	

Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments	<p>The idea developed in this study agrees perfectly with the concept of the sustainable development. The results are relevant. But, the author may gainfully rephrase the sentences and readjust the punctuation for a final manuscript digestible for the scientific community.</p> <p>The Author must clearly indicate why he decided to carry the study and, at the end, he must clearly list his findings in the conclusion.</p>	
Optional/General comments	<p>The idea is good. The results are interesting. But the manuscript needs readjustments.</p>	

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:	Fopoussi Tuebue Jean Christophe
Department, University & Country	Jesus and Mary Secondary High School, Cameroon