

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Plant Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_APRJ_127311
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparative assessment of the effect of three plant spacing on the performance of early and late maize (Zea mays L.) varieties cultivated in the Humid tropics, Port Harcourt, Rivers State
Type of the Article	

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

Compulsory REVISION comments	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)
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.	This manuscript has great role in scientific community. I like this manuscript as it provides comprehensive information about maize cultivation..	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes , title is suitable	
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.	Abstract is good no need to add or delete any thing from the article.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes but in subsection 2.6 a , b , c , d and e should be bold . It should be uniform .	
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.	Work upon the above mentioned thing and check whether all things are correct or not. Work upon the conclusion portion as it should be more. Give good overview there.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	Yes , references sufficient and recent .	
Minor REVISION comments	Yes , language is perfect .	
Is the 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:	Bhuvan Joshi
Department, University & Country	Agriculture and Forestry University, Nepal