

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_91777
Title of the Manuscript:	Pre-sowing seed treatment of selected Organics and botanicals on Growth, Seed yield and Yield attributing traits of maize (Zea mays. L) Var. VNR-4226
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>)

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><i>The comments in this and the next section are intended to provide useful suggestions to the author in order to make the work more attractive. Let us proceed step by step.</i></p> <p>CRc1) First of all, please explain why the seed treatment is important. More specifically, put in evidence that seed treatment involves the use of biological or chemical agents to control or contain primary soil and seed borne infestation of insects and diseases which affects crop productivity and crop production. So, the main objectives of seed treatment are to induce early germination and prevent seed-borne pathogens and pests.</p> <p>CRc2) Please, specify the three different methods of seed treatment. In particular: 1) <i>Seed dressing;</i> 2) <i>Seed coating;</i> 3) <i>Seed pelleting.</i></p> <p>CRc3) It is known that fungicides captan, etridiazole, or thiram (1.5 g/kg seed), or combinations of captan + benodanil, captan + metalaxyl, or benomyl + fenaminosulf (0.75 + 0.75 g/kg) increase numbers of emerged seedlings in a field trial by 37–50%. Please compare the effect of treatments on the mean performance of maize proposed by the author, and summarised in Table 1 and Table 2, with those obtained by the standard Zea mays L.</p> <p>CRc4) Please discuss the four main disadvantages of seed treatment i.e., 1) <i>Limited protection under high pest pressure;</i> 2) <i>Duration of protection</i> (seed treatment may not provide protection for long enough to provide complete protection to the establishing crop); 3) <i>Limited shelf life of treated seed;</i> 4) <i>Phytotoxicity</i> (some seed treatments may be phytotoxic when applied at high rates).</p> <p>CRc5) Now, please mention what are the main limitations of Zea mays L. proposed by the author.</p> <p>CRc6) The study on the impact of different dose of plant nutrient on growth, quality, yield and economics of maize has been object the work appeared in International Journal of Plants and Soil Science 21(5): 1-8, 2018; Article n° IJPSS.3944. ISSN: 2320-7035. Please, highlight the main differences between the results obtained by the authors of this work (which are illustrated in Table 1., Table 2. and Table 3. on page 5 and 6 of the manuscript) with those of the present work (shown in Table 3 on page 12).</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>MRc1) Please, check the English; several typos have been detected.</p> <p>MRc2) The abstract is written in an unattractive and not fluent way. In my opinion it should be rewritten to attract the reader's attention more. My advice is to rewrite the abstract with less technical details but with more concepts.</p> <p>MRc4) There are some factors that significantly influence the seed treatment of maize that are not mentioned in this paper.</p> <p>MRc5) The work should be better framed in the context of the works in this topic that have recently appeared in the literature. The list of works cited in "<i>References</i>" should be completed accordingly.</p>	
Optional/General comments	In my opinion the work is not well structured and, written in this form, it is not very attractive. The above suggestions can be used as a guide to rewrite some parts of the paper and, at the same time, are useful for filling some gaps in the manuscript.	

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:	Giorgio Sonnino
Department, University & Country	Université Libre de Bruxelles, Belgium