

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_87431
Title of the Manuscript:	Nitrogen use efficiency and maize performance through application of urea stable and urea in Nitisol of Midakegn and Toke Kutaye districts
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.journalijpss.com/index.php/IJPSS/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	<p>REVIEWERS COMMENTS</p> <p>TITLE The title shows a relevant study The title should be rephrased and shortene Keywords: Should be up to 5. But no word found in title should be part of keyword.</p> <p>ABSTARCT The principal reason for the analysis was not captured in abstract. Please add. Rewrite abstract to capture the novelty of the work. Also, the abstract is tied to the title. I could not find the objective statement (principal reason). A reader would expect recommendation which was clearly written</p> <p>INTRODUCTION The research aim/objective can be rewritten and improved The novelty sentence "but no information is known yet for maize production in the country" should be audacious by discussing absence of the knowledge/gap in other studies. Overall the text isnt difficult to follow but flows naturally. However a good introduction should be up to 700 word count. Recent citations were not observed and should be added.</p> <p>MATERIALS AND METHODS No mention of Figure 1 in materials/methods section or elsewhere some places in Soil and plant sample analysis had a different font from the others? Overall the text was not difficult to follow and authors detailed the validity of the approach. Sample size was sufficient Besides that, methodology is apprrpriate with the statistical analysis which can be made robust with additional statistical parameter Title of Fig 1 could be made better. study map of what?</p> <p>RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS Some subtitles should be rephrased and improved eg...Effects Nitrogen Fertilizer Rates on growth.....("of" is missing) A lot of typo errors.please correct nitrogen rate didn't significantlydo not use colloquial words. please change. Nitrogen agronomic efficiency of the maize crop was decreasing with increasing of nitrogen dose applied.... this sentence should be rephrased. The complete absence of Figures is unacceptable. Author must present at least 1-3 figures (excluding map). The figures must be labelled and discussed appropriately. Overall they explanations were adequate and over interpretation were avoided.</p> <p>Conclusion. The authors may recommend the use of urea/urea staple in studies/modeling that predict the releaionship/effects with maize crop and family with precision and accuracy.</p> <p>FIGURES AND TABLES There were no defective figures nor tables (only one figure)</p> <p>SUMMARY The Text was not difficult to follow Statistics was insufficient and no error treatment Results presented clearly and logically but may need to be further compared with findings from previous studies The study did not fully capture the novelty which should be a progress in urea/urea staple in maize crop.</p> <p>REFERENCES The references were in order but very old and needs to be updated to recent studies</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

Review Form 1.6

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Amarachi Nkwoada
Department, University & Country	Federal University of Technology Owerri, Nigeria