

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_103819
Title of the Manuscript:	Response of Spacing and Nitrogen on Yield and Economics of Kharif Sweetcorn (Zea mays L. saccharata)
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:

(<https://www.journalijpss.com/index.php/IJPSS/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The MS is of general importance with very regular or common treatment and do not have any innovation treatment or observations. With these general observations/data and treatment variable, applicability of research is questionable. Editor should see for the innovativeness in research presented in this MS. 2. Yes 3. Abstract: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No need of writing soil initial properties in abstract; • Mention objective clearly along with treatment variables; • Result should be written in the form of increase in grain yield or any other important parameter over control/ check or inferior treatment. • Avoid giving the values for all parameter measured for best treatment (This make abstract difficult to read and get some conclusion). 4. Yes 5. Yes 6. References: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of references enlisted in the reference section is not cited in the entire MS. See for correction; • Cross check the reference for their presence both in text and reference list. • Strictly follow the reference writing style of the Journal both for citing references in text and enlisting them in reference list. <p>Introduction:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Avoid general information on sweet maize/corn, nitrogen nutrition and plan spacing in introduction section; • Include the review of literature on effect of crop nutrition and plant geometry on sweet maize or any other type of maize; • Author has to define research gap clearly followed by writing the objective of study. <p>Material and methods: The material and method section need to rewrite considering following points:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Information on climate of selected location and weather condition prevailing during experimentation duration. 2. Information on crop cultivation practices were not given and need to mention; 3. Information on procedure of measurement of growth and yield parameters were not mentioned. <p>Results and discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trend in green cob yield and straw yield was same; hence results need to be combined; • It is difficult to understand-, If harvest index is higher T-8, than how both grain as well as straw yield is higher in same treatment? Moreover in table 1 Harvest index was reported as non-significant; while in text, it is written as significantly superior for T8 treatment. • Replace "x" with sign "x" from symbol in MS word. • The economics need to be discussed rather than just giving higher and lower value for cost of cultivation and gross and net return. • Authors have to give yield attributes data as well as growth parameter data [As the data presented is not sufficient to be published as research paper and that too for single season.]. • Express the values of cost of cultivation, gross return and net returns in multiple of 1000 for ease in reading of table (This is most commonly followed). • Cross returns, net returns and B:C ration can be given with statistical significance; See for the needful. <p>Conclusion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Write percent increase in grain and straw yield best treatment over control or inferior treatment. 	

Review Form 1.7

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Also write increase in return in best treatment over control or inferior treatment.	
Minor REVISION comments	-	
1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	-	

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:	Amit A. Shahane
Department, University & Country	Central Agricultural University, India