

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)
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.	The work in the manuscript is informative to certain extent. In this study effect of sowing method, weed control methods and herbicides application has been evaluated on grain yield, biological yield, stower yield, harvesting index, protein content and protein yield of one maize hybrid in a thorough manner. However, the results may have effect of germplasm as only one hybrid has been taken in the study which may turn out as a limitation. While, in the section of materials and methods, the author/s have set up field experiment to assess the most suitable hybrid maize variety for effect of sowing methods, weed management and growth promoters on weed dynamics, growth and economics, no such study is conducted as only one hybrid maize was evaluated.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
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.	A plenty of errors are there in Abstract. For example: first line ends with at students; weed management practice 'W ₂ ' are different at two places in the abstract; 'W ₄ ' has been used for two different weed management practices. Years of experiments are different at two places within abstract itself.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Acknowledgments and Conflict of interest declarations are missing/ hidden	
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 is scientifically robust and technically sound. Data collection and analysis is optimum with SE(d) and CD (P= 0.05). One hybrid maize for the experiment is a limitation. In result section, units are missing at a few places in the text.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	A few more recent (year 2020 onwards) may be added. Also, both in the text and in the reference section uniformity in writing of references are required.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Duplications in writing for example 'maize and sorghum grown on ridges yielded 14 to 106 percent and 6 to 59 percent respectively compared to planting on flat beds.'- Introduction section should be avoided. Also, errors in mentioning of year of experiments, weed control method signage etc. need to be corrected in various sections throughout the text.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

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:	Shweta Singh
Department, University & Country	College of Biotechnology, Birsa Agricultural University, India