

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Advances in Biology &amp; Biotechnology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_126616
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Synergistic effects of mulching and integrated nutrient management practices on maize (Zea mays)</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Research</b>

#### **General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the 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**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> <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 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.	The manuscript summarizes the original research findings, that can add up into the field of ecofriendly production practices for the sustainability of Farming	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
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.	Yes	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
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.	The manuscript provides good set of significant and non-significant results with justifiable standard errors of mean, showing that the results are trustworthy	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The discussion section was a bit poor due to the support of results from other crops and some outdated research works. Considering this, I have included a few recent reports specifically supporting the findings of rainfed maize biometric, physiological and yield improvements. I am hoping that authors would consider including the valuable citations in their paper.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	Yes	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The article is well written, I wish best of luck to the authors for such a valuable research. Thanks Please consider the attached word file, enable track changes Mode to access my comments and ask the authors to address these for submitting the revised version of manuscript. I suggest minor revisions with provisional Acceptance. Thanks	

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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:	Talveer Singh
Department, University & Country	University of Texas at El Paso, United States