

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>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.</p> <p>2. Yes, it is an interesting title.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>4. Yes, the manuscript's layout is well-organized.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>6. Yes, it is sufficient and dated</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	No, you should revise again.	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Getnet Tigabu
Department, University & Country	Ethiopia Forestry Development, Ethiopia