

ReviewForm3

JournalName:	InternationalJournalof Plant&SoilScience
ManuscriptNumber:	Ms_IJPSS_121849
TitleoftheManuscript:	Effectoftillageandnutrientmanagementpracticesonnormalizeddifferencevegetationindexofmaize
TypeoftheArticle	

ReviewForm3

PART1: ReviewComments

Compulsory REVISIONcomments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>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.</p>	<p>This manuscript is significant for the scientific community as it provides valuable insights into the impact of various tillage practices and nutrient management strategies on the health of maize crops, assessed through the Normalized Difference Vegetation Index (NDVI). The study's findings suggest that zero tillage and conventional tillage with chisel plough are particularly effective in promoting robust vegetative growth, as indicated by higher NDVI values. The research also highlights the adaptability of different nutrient management practices, showing that they can sustain maize growth under varying environmental conditions. Moreover, the manuscript emphasizes the negative correlation between NDVI and certain weather parameters, offering a deeper understanding of how environmental factors influence crop health. These insights are crucial for optimizing agricultural practices to improve crop yield and sustainability, making this study a valuable contribution to the field of agronomy.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Acceptable</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>Acceptable</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The manuscript is well-organized, with clear subsections for the introduction, methodology, results, discussion, and conclusion. Each section logically flows into the next, providing a cohesive narrative that is easy to follow. The detailed description of treatments, experimental site, and data collection methods enhances the manuscript's transparency and reproducibility.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The study applies a split-plot design, which is appropriate given the complexity of the treatments involving multiple tillage practices and nutrient management strategies. This design ensures that the effects of these variables are accurately captured and analysed. • The use of NDVI as an indicator of crop health is well-established in agricultural research. The study's methodology, including the specific use of GreenSeeker for NDVI measurements, is appropriate and consistent with current practices in precision agriculture. • The manuscript mentions the use of Fischer's method for analysis of variance and the application of OPSTAT software for statistical analysis, which are both standard and reliable methods. The use of critical difference for evaluating treatment differences further strengthens the analysis. • The inclusion of correlation studies between NDVI values and weather parameters adds depth to the analysis, allowing for a better understanding of the external factors influencing crop health. 	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>Acceptable</p>	

ReviewForm3

<u>Minor REVISION</u> comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	YES	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	In conclusion: 1. standardising: <input type="checkbox"/> the use of English US or UK <input type="checkbox"/> Reference style to comply with journal requirement <input type="checkbox"/> Proofread the manuscript carefully to correct any grammatical or typographical errors. <input type="checkbox"/> Ensure consistency in the use of terminology throughout the manuscript.	

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:	Julyus Melvin Mobilik
Department, University & Country	Maritime Transport Training Institute, Malaysia