

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	Full length paper

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 <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.	The manuscript is important as biofertilizers are applied along with the RDF for maintenance of soil health and fertility. Effect of enriched FYM on growth and yield of sweet corn is being studied in detail here, which is important from nutrient management point of view. The economics gives an idea about the profitability of sweet corn.	
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.	Yes.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	YES.	
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 article is scientifically correct. But some mistakes are there, which is underlined in the attachment for necessary correction before publication.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Its OK.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	YES. Little grammatical mistakes are there which should be rectified.	
Optional/General comments	It is a good paper and can be published after some corrections.	

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:	Anita Mahapatra
Department, University & Country	College of Agriculture, Odisha University of Agriculture and Technology, India