

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_127392
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of FYM, areca husk compost and coir pith compost on growth, yield and quality of baby corn (Zea mays L.)
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The manuscript entitled: Effect of FYM, areca husk compost and coir pith compost on growth, yield and quality of baby corn (Zea mays L.), contains sufficient information for the interest of scientific community about the effects compost and FYM in various combinations on the growth of field grown baby corn. ○ The authors presented the data on plant growth and quality parameters that are sufficient to justify the conclusion drawn. ○ Various studies showed that application of organic material like compost and FYM improve soil health by improving soil biological, physical and chemical properties. This study emphasizes on the effect of these amendments on plant growth which is very informative aspect of this study 	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	I suggest alternative title which better reflect the study and it results: Comparative effect of FYM, Areca husk compost, and Coir pith compost on the growth performance and yield quality of baby corn (Zea Mays L.)	
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.	Overall abstract is comprehensive. However, it will be better if add one sentence of the study conclusion at the end of the abstract.	
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 with title; "Effect of FYM, areca husk compost and coir pith compost on growth, yield and quality of baby corn (Zea mays L.)" tested 12 treatments with 3 replication which scientifically correct for statistical analysis of the data. The study correlated that N supplied by organic amendments improved plant growth parameters, yeild and quality parameters like protein, fibre and starch content which is technically sound.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :	I suggest authors to add few more references to make manuscript scientifically robust and comprehensive. Here are few but authors can cite some other relevant studies. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Shah, S.H., M.B. Hussain, G. Haider, T.U. Haq, Z.A. Zahir, S. Danish, B.A. Paray and C. Kammann. 2023. Acidified manure and nitrogen-enriched biochar showed short-term agronomic benefits on cotton-wheat cropping systems under alkaline arid field conditions. Sci. Rep. 13: 22504. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-023-48996-4 2. Alotibi, M.M., N.M. Alotaibi, G.S. Hussain, S. Hussain, S.H. Shah, A.M. Ghoneim, K. Dawar and M. Hareem. 2023. Use of zinc quantum dot biochar and AMF for alleviation of Cd stress in maize: Regulation of physiological and biochemical attributes. Plant Stress. 10: 100262. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stress.2023.100262 	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	I suggest authors to review the manuscript for English grammar errors and correct those.	
Optional/General comments	The manuscript can be accepted for publication after incorporating the above suggestions.	

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:	Suleman Haider Shah
Department, University & Country	Pakistan