

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Experimental Agriculture International</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JEAI_121255</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Boosting Sweet Corn (<i>Zea mays convar. saccharata</i> L.): Impact of Humic Acid Foliar Spray and Nutrient Levels on Yield and Quality</b>
Type of the Article	

## Review Form 3

### PART 1: Review Comments

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<p><b>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b></p>	<p>The authors aimed to conduct a field experiment to study the effect of foliar application of humic acid on the growth and yield of Sweet corn (<i>Zea mays</i> convar. <i>saccharata</i> L.) at AHRS Kathalagere, University of Agricultural and Horticultural Sciences, Shivamogga during the summer of 2021.</p>	
<p><b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b></p>	<p>Long and preferred to be modified into "<b>Humic Acid Foliation and Nutrient Levels Concerning Yield and Quality of Sweet Corn</b>" for more understanding and readability</p>	
<p><b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</b></p>	<p>Please notice the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Clear to a certain extent.</li> <li>b. Many modifications were recommended to enhance the readability and understanding.</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Keywords:</b> Re-arrange and modify in alphabetical order as suggested.</li> <li>2. <b>Introduction:</b> Improperly displayed into four large paragraphs. The introduction has to be assigned into three paragraphs i.e. 1. Introduction 2. Significance of the study, and 3. Aim of the study. Some modifications were suggested to enhance readability and understanding.</li> <li>3. <b>The aim:</b> A few modifications were suggested to enhance readability and understanding.</li> <li>4. <b>Materials and methods:</b> Please notice the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MUST provide the institutional ethical approval.</li> <li>• MUST provide the microclimatic conditions of the experimental unit that might influence the entire study such as temperature, relative humidity, airflow, and light duration.</li> <li>• Provide the model and the source of the electrical conductivity (EC) meter.</li> <li>• Provide the tool used to measure the nutrient levels (Carbon, nitrogen, potassium, and phosphorus) and model and the source of these tools.</li> <li>• Do not use the "percent" word and use the (%) sign instead</li> <li>• Provide the statistical model used in the statistical analysis.</li> <li>• Many modifications were suggested to enhance the readability and understanding of the text.</li> </ul> </li> <li>5. <b>Results:</b> Please notice the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reduce the illustrations of numbers and normal ranges as they are listed in tables.</li> <li>• MUST list the P-value for the significant results.</li> <li>• Use the abbreviations of the treatment names instead of listing full descriptions of them all over.</li> <li>• Many modifications were suggested to enhance the readability and understanding of the text.</li> </ul> </li> <li>6. <b>Discussion:</b> Clear to a certain extent with moderate comparison and speculation. Some modifications were suggested to enhance the readability and understanding of the text.</li> <li>7. <b>Conclusion:</b> Some modifications were suggested to enhance the readability and understanding of the text.</li> <li>8. <b>Tables:</b> Use the abbreviations of the treatments and list their details in the table footnotes.</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b></p>	<p>The manuscript highlighted that with increasing effects of humic acid on crude protein, total sugars, reducing sugars, and non-reducing sugars, farmers can achieve a higher yield and good quality of sweet corn to fulfill the increasing demand.</p>	

### Review Form 3

<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	MUST BE UPDATED as 9.1% (2 out of 22) of the listed references were published in the past five years. The percentage has to increase to at least 35-40%. The old references indicate poor study and that the study is no longer a point of interest.	
<u>Minor REVISION</u> comments <b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	<b>General view:</b> The manuscript was expressed in moderate English and grammar. Professional copyediting and proofreading, providing an opening statement in the abstract, proper display of the introduction section, declaring many explanations in the materials and methods section, and proper update of the references have to be carried out before resubmission to achieve publishing value.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

### **PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	<b>Essam Samir Soliman</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Suez Canal University, Egypt</b>