

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_125943
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of enriched farm yard manure on growth and yield of sweet corn (Zea mays var. Saccharata)
Type of the Article	Research

General guidelines for the Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

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.	This manuscript is important for the scientific community as it addresses critical gaps in Agricultural research field and offers innovative insights. I appreciate the clarity of its methodology and the relevance of its findings.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Suitable	
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 of this article is fairly comprehensive, as it includes the key elements such as the objectives, treatments, and significant results	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The subsections and structure of the manuscript appear appropriate for a scientific study. The key components, such as the introduction, methodology, results, discussion, and conclusion, seem to be well addressed.	
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 appears scientifically robust and technically sound due to its well-designed field experiment with clearly defined treatments, such as different combinations of enriched farm yard manure (FYM) with RDF and microbial inoculants like Azospirillum , Gluconobacter , and PSB . The use of these biofertilizers in combination with FYM aligns with sustainable agricultural practices and addresses important factors affecting the growth and yield of sweet corn. The study follows a logical progression from hypothesis to experimentation, with measurable parameters like plant height, leaf area, and yield well documented. The results are backed by statistical analysis, which adds to the scientific rigor, and the discussion of economic benefits further enhances its practical applicability.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Overall, the manuscript has a strong foundation but could benefit from targeted revisions to enhance its suitability for scholarly communication.	
Optional/General comments	This reflects the need for significant improvements in language quality, clarity, and organization, as well as ensuring that the references are sufficient and relevant for scholarly communication	

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:	Anil Kumar Yadav
Department, University & Country	India