

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_124381
Title of the Manuscript:	GENETIC DIVERSITY OF MAIZE (<i>Zea mays</i> L.) GENOTYPES UNDER LOW LEVEL OF NITROGEN
Type of the Article	Research

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
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 is important as it focuses on the diversity study of maize under low nitrogen level hence genotypes which could perform well under such circumstances could be identified and further used in scientific studies.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, the title of the manuscript is suitable and appropriate for the manuscript.	
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.	The abstract is not very comprehensive. It should mainly focus on the major results. Some part of the introductions and material and methods could be omitted here. Mean values of the clusters of major importance could be included here.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The sub sections of the manuscript are appropriate.	
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.	Italicize <i>Kharif</i> in and <i>viz.</i> , in materials and methods. Use brackets as and when required and close them when completing the sentence. In the M & M the authors have mentioned that nine characters when taken in the study however 10 characters were there. Please check these minor mistakes. The authors have not mentioned the software used in this study include them also. In results, authors have mentioned that a total of 7 clusters were made however there were only 6 clusters. Please check and correct such mistakes. In discussion no reference has been given justifying the results produced by the authors. Include such references and make the discussion more scientific and comprehensive.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are sufficient and however the citing is not according to the journal's guidelines. Please follow the guidelines and make the changes appropriately. Recent references need to be included.	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language used needs to be more scientific with no grammatical mistakes.	
Optional/General comments	Include more keywords as of now only three keywords has been included in the manuscript. This manuscript major revision. In its present form it can not be published in the journal. However, after making the necessary changes the manuscript can be considered for publication.	

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:	Shorya Kapoor
Department, University & Country	CSK HPKV, India