



SDI Review Form 1.6

=

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_44573
Title of the Manuscript:	Maize response to leguminous biomass composted with phosphate rocks in the Northern zone of Tanzania
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/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



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>Author has a great output but should package it in a compelling state i.e. this is what my study has brought to fore. As it is, all is not clearly linked to “adding to the knowledge of science”.</p> <p>This is something more tied to expression rather than data – expression of the key punchlines could be done at a sitting.</p> <p>Otherwise, good research work!</p>	<p>We agreed with the reviewer's comment. The comment has been taken into account and corrections have been made as highlighted on page 18 line number 332-333 , page 21 line 390-391 and line number 403-406 of the revised manuscript.</p>
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Check on obvious typos and sentence flow. See attached PDF.</p>	<p>All typos indicated in the PDF have been corrected. However, please note the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The word "term" as used on line 14 of the abstract is meant to describe duration of the variety to mature and differentiates it from short term and long term varieties as used in plant breeding and agronomy. Removal from the sentence will make it incomplete and confusing. 2. The word Clotarialia on line number 24 of the revised abstract (line number 27 in reviewer's PDF) was retained because total number of key words did not exceed 8 words specified as a maximum in the authors' guide. 3. The term "soil fertility" as used on line number 45 of the revised manuscript (line number 48 in reviewer's PDF) refers to the capacity/ability of the soil to provide essential nutrient elements in required amounts, forms, right proportions and at the right time for plant growth. The word fertility was retained because "soil" alone would be too broad or meaningless. 4. The words biomass was cut above the ground were rephrased instead of being deleted as recommended by the reviewer on line 98 of the PDF because the biomass was not left to air dry while standing in the field as this could result into further lignification of legume stems hence widening the C:N ratio; translocation of nutrients into seeds and defoliation losses. 5. Changes made on the foot note (line 160 of the revised manuscript) makes further clarification on the layout of maize field experiment (figure 2) in response to reviewer's comment on line 141-144 of the PDF .
Optional/General comments	N/A	



SDI 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?	<u><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></u>	Authors declare no ethical issues in this manuscript because the study neither involved human nor animal subjects. As far as this study is concerned; none of the experiments involved human.