

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Soil Science and Plant Nutrition
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJSSPN_120430
Title of the Manuscript:	Soil n-total, n-plant content, and yield of sweet corn (zea mays I. Saccharata) due to the application of a combination of liquid and single compound npk fertilizer on inceptisols from jatinangor
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://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory 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>
Please write few sentences regarding the importance this manuscript for scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript is important for scientific community given its contribution in the field of agriculture. The manuscript has the study of increasing the yield and quality of corn in Indonesia by adding fertilizers into the soil.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Suitable.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Abstract is comprehensive, but there is a discrepancy in the period of study as commented in the manuscript.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	They are appropriate.	
Please write few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. The experiments were done correctly and compared to a control soil.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. -	Most of the references are recent and sufficient.	
Minor REVISION comments Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language is suitable for scholarly communications.	
Optional/General comments	There are some errors such as labelling, date of study and one typing error.	

Review Form 3

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:	Alifia Hamzah Johari
Department, University & Country	Malaysia