

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_119365
Title of the Manuscript:	Response of various nitrogen levels and plant growth regulator on production and productivity of wheat crop (Triticum aestivum L.)
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
<p><u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The article entitled "Response of various nitrogen levels and plant growth regulator on production and productivity of wheat crop (Triticum aestivum L.)", has fulfilled the terms and conditions from a research perspective, and the research results are useful for examining the response to various nitrogen levels and growth regulators on the production and productivity of wheat plants (Triticum aestivum L.). 2. In my opinion, the title given to the article fulfills the research aspect, you only need to consider the statement of various nitrogen levels, in my opinion the response to nitrogen levels is sufficient, the parameters used can be explained in the introduction. 3. Globally, the description presented in the abstract should be further simplified, so that what is done in the research can be described clearly. In my opinion, the description in the abstract is divided into the background of the problem to be researched, a description of the process using concepts, or comparative methods used in the research, and then a conclusion on the results obtained from the research. For the abstract writing structure, please conform to the guidelines, do not write subsections in the abstract <p>It is better to use a percentage value to show good performance improvement results compared to previous methods or research.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. In my opinion, globally it is good, there is only a need for a little explanation of the terms used in each sub. For the writing structure, please look again at the written structure that has been determined. 5. In my opinion, the manuscript written is scientifically appropriate, it just needs further explanation regarding the data used and processed in the research carried out 6. The references provided are good, you only need comparative references from research that has been carried out by other researchers to be able to determine the novelty of the research carried out. 	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>Please check again as a whole, especially the writing structure, thank you</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>Introductory Part: It would be better if the introduction section shows the steps or stages of the research which are described in the form of a flowchart or work flow. Show the novelty of the research you conducted, as well as its relationship to previous research. A more specific description is needed regarding the relationship between survey data and the process concept carried out in research.</p> <p>Conclusion: Provide a more structured and simpler description that shows that the results of the research carried out are effective.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>The statement in the conclusion is still too global and does not show a more specific statement of results from a process carried out in the research, provide further explanation regarding the statement "The application of plant growth regulator (Chlormequat chloride 0.2%) decreasing plant height while increasing biological yield, suggests that more robust stem production is occurring. This, in turn, lowers the likelihood of lodging up to the application of 150% RDN (N180, P60, K40) with growth regulator (Chlormequat chloride 0.2%) and produces the maximum grain yield", especially in the statement "The application of growth regulators (Chlormequat chloride 0.2%) reduces plant height while increasing biological yield, and the statement "produces maximum grain yield", provide a brief explanation of the relationship between these two statements. It is best to use percentage values to show comparison of observation results from previous methods or previous research results.</p>	
--	---	--

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:	Ir. Chairuddin
Department, University & Country	STMIK IM, Indonesia