

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Soil Science and Plant Nutrition
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJSSPN_115329
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of planting density and nitrogen levels on the yield attributing characters of fodder maize (Shalimar Fodder Maize-1)
Type of the Article	

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>Compulsory 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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Effect of planting density and nitrogen levels on the yield attributing characters of fodder maize (Shalimar Fodder Maize-1)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The manuscript is important for scientific community since the result may become a basis to potentially increase the yield of fodder maize 2. The title is suitable. 3. The abstract of the article was not comprehensive. 4. The subsections and structure of the manuscript are not appropriate. 5. Yes, it is scientifically correct since the nature of the study was done thru scientific way 6. The references are sufficient enough <p>Additional Comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. the introduction about the fodder maize was comprehensive. However, it can further improved if the possible effect of planting density and nitrogen levels will be explained or elaborate further, Including past studies about the topic is also advisable. 2. Improve the methodology by explaining further the different procedure involve in obtaining the desired data. The methodology should include all the procedure as well as its source or where it is based on. 3. The result of the study was presented very well. All the data needed and statements to support the obtained data was presented and discussed. 4. The conclusion was stated very-well. 5. The abstract should be improved by providing the summary of the result and conclusion in the latter part. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>The language/English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <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:	Jomell M. Santiago
Department, University & Country	Nueva Ecija University of Science and Technology, Philippines