

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_128658
Title of the Manuscript:	GROWTH AND YIELD OF SWEET CORN AS INFLUENCED BY NITROGEN FERTILIZATION LEVEL AND CROP GEOMETRY.
Type of the Article	

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: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript could have been important for the scientific community if it had followed proper rules of a scientific articles. The theme of the manuscript was good as it evaluated spacing of maze farming and reduction of the use of nitrogen, but the study was done wrongly.	
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, as per my assumption the abstract is not suitable for a scientific article. Abstract need to be precise, concise and specific. This abstract is mare description of methodology and result without specific objective. I suggested some addition and substruction in the manuscript.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	I think, this procedure is not correct, because I have found some anomaly in the split plot method and in the result section.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	No, the researcher did not include any references in the introduction part. I think the researcher must include reference for the introduction part.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Language is enough for publication, but research accuracy more important than language.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

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:	Mahadi Hasan Monshi
Department, University & Country	University of Chittagong, Bangladesh