

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_122723
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECT OF SOWING METHODS AND DIFFERENT LEVELS OF NITROGEN ON YIELD ATTRIBUTES AND YIELD OF MAIZE
Type of the Article	Original Research 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>1 Provide factual data on the current status of corn production in the region/national level and connect these information to the need of conducting this present study. 2. A benchmarking should be added to your work. It means that you should evaluate your results by comparison with other published papers in the field. 3. Highlight the significance of conducting this study by addressing specific SDGs.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>EFFECT OF SOWING METHODS AND DIFFERENT LEVELS OF NITROGEN ON YIELD ATTRIBUTES AND YIELD OF MAIZE</p> <p>Specific data on yield attributes has not found in the manuscript whether or not it is affected by these two factors: sowing method and application of different levels of N.</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>The abstract section is not a good representative of the whole manuscript. The abstract should contain the purpose of the work, brief background, a comparison with other works, and stating the power and loss regarding other works.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The subsections and structure of the manuscript is appropriate, but attention is given on the above mentioned suggestions to make it more comprehensive.</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>1. Provide factual data on the current status of corn production in the region/national level and connect these information to the need of conducting this present study. 2. A benchmarking should be added to your work. It means that you should evaluate your results by comparison with other published papers in the field (Agriculture). 3. Scientific data on the yield attributes of maize as to whether or not it is affected by the sowing method or application of different levels of N is not clearly stated in the results. 4. Highlight the significance of conducting this study by addressing specific SDGs.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>References must include valid DOIs and must be dated.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Language quality is suitable for scholarly communications.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>A benchmarking should be added to your work. It means that you should evaluate your results by comparison with other published papers in the field. Cited articles must be up to date. Applications of N to maize is known that has significant effect of its growth or yield. Soil analysis is recommended to provide exact amount of Macro or micro nutrients as amendments to the soil before addressing the deficiency requirements.</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:	Hene L. Hapinat
Department, University & Country	Northern Iloilo State University, Philippines