

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Plant Research Journal</a>
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

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<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>	This topic has relevance , particularly practical application for commercial cultivation	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	I suggest the following modification of title: "Effect of three plant spacing on the performance of maize ( <i>Zea mays</i> L.) varieties in the Humid tropics of Port Harcourt, Rivers State"	
<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>	The Abstract is very apt and crisp, and to the point giving all pertinent information in a brief manner	
<b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>	I suggest that the materials and methods can be summarised in a few paragraphs – running text Eg : paras 2.1 to 2.5 in one or two paragraphs ; and 206 in another paragraph	
<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>	The results and discussion are presented in well	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	yes	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	Language is fine;	
<b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	May be accepted for publication ; Modification of tile is suggested	

### 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>V.S.Devadas</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>School of Agriculture, GIET University, India</b>