

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_124160
Title of the Manuscript:	“Effect of sowing methods, weed management and growth promoters on yield and quality behavior of Kharif Maize (Zea mays L).”
Type of the Article	

Review Form 3

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)
<p>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.</p>	<p>Maize (<i>Zea mays</i> L.) is one of the most versatile crops with wider adaptability in various agro ecologies. Maize is an important cereal crop in terms of the agricultural economy, both as food for human and feed for animals. Method of sowing has a great role to play in increasing maize yield. Our farmers generally use the broadcast method of sowing with so many disadvantages i.e. uneven distributions of seeds, depth, and seed lying scattered being picked up by birds. The present investigation was carried out during two consecutive kharif season in years 2022 and 2023 at students. Instructional Farm, Department of Agronomy, Chandra Shekhar Azad University of Agriculture and Technology, Kanpur (U. P).</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Yes, it is</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>Yes, it is.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The Introduction is written in a compact block. It can be divided into several paragraphs to make it easier to read. In addition, I suggest reflecting the objective of the study at the end. The Materials and Methods are also written in a compact block. I propose to break them up a bit. I propose that the tables be presented as soon as they are mentioned in the text, to make the content more understandable.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The experiment was laid out in Split Plot Design keeping sowing methods in main plot and weed management practices in sub plots with growth promoters in sub – sub plots with three replications. There was two sowing methods viz; Conventional methods (S₁) and Ridge methods (S₂). Whereas weed management practices were five, viz; Weed Free (W₁), Weedy Check (W₂), Atrazine Pre-emergence @ 1.25 Kg /ha (W₃), Halosulfuron methyl Post-emergence @ 65g a.i./ha (W₄), Atrazine Pre-emergence @ 0.75 l/ha + Halosulfuron methyl Post-emergence @ 35g ai./ha (W₄). and there was Growth promoters' practices were three viz; Gibberellic acid (Sayish) (G₁), Amino acid + Humic acid (Spring ever) (G₂), Cytokinins + Enzymes (Ambition) (G₃).</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =</p>	<p>The references are sufficient; but I suggest using the abbreviations in the title of the journals, according to those established internationally. Value, if possible, the updating of references, so that approximately 50% of them are from the last five years.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes, it is</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

Review Form 3

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:	Jesus G. Rodriguez Diego
Department, University & Country	Autonomous Metropolitan University, Mexico