



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2015_AJEA_17984
Title of the Manuscript:	Micro-Dosing of Inorganic Inputs on Maize Production on an Acid Soil in Kenya: An Agronomic and Economic Evaluation
Type of the Article	Research

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		
Minor REVISION comments	Should be corrected according to reviewer's comments which indicated in the text.	- Line 1-2 title page: Replacing on an with at would completely change the meaning of the title since the work was done on one site. - Line 13: has been corrected to read "P and N thereby reduce" - Line 14: deleting "by about 16, 28, and 30%, respectively" would not be correct because quantifying the amount of losses in the introduction of an agronomic and economic study is important. - Line 15 (part 1): Kenya include deleted as suggested. - Line 15 (part 2): have been corrected to read on average - Line 15 (part 3): 5 tons/ha was suggested. However, reference 6 (Sanchez et al, 1997 on page 5 talks about land cereal grain yield potential of 2 – 4 tons/ha with 4 tons/ha being the highest potential. Therefore, left as it was before. - Line 131: Has been corrected as suggested to read "Effect of inorganic fertilizers and lime on maize grain yield" - Line 132: Deleted as suggested - Line 133 (part 1): Table 2 inserted as suggested - Line 133 (part 2) has been corrected as suggested and reads "148 % due 50% of the recommended rate of N fertilizer, 40% due to 50% of the recommended rate of P fertilizer" - Line 143 reference 4 and 15 which describe the write up included. - Line 146; Table 3: The highlighted Mean for N we did get what the reviewer wanted since the mean for P had no question was raised. - Line 146; Table 3: Deleting the information statistical data analysis would render agronomic data meaningless therefore we not effected the changes suggested by the reviewer. - Line 193 the highlighted section 148 and 40 corrected and read as 148 % due 50% of the recommended rate of N fertilizer, 40% due to 50% of the recommended rate of P fertilizer



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments		The reviewers comments were very important and helped us to improve the paper
---	--	---