

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_86332
Title of the Manuscript:	Influence of Spacing and Potassium Application on Baby corn (Zea mays L.)
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://www.journalijpss.com/index.php/IJPSS/editorial-policy>

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>The authors have conducted to study the effects of the amount of potassium and plant spacing and density on plant production and growth condition. Overall, the result has significantly practical importance for improving plant yield. However, in my opinion, the manuscript has to be improved in the following aspects:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In the Introduction part, the authors had described the general background of the study well, but it seems that it is not clear enough why the authors conducted this study? What is the goal of the study? Please write down the goal of the study and how the authors approached the goal. 2. Please check the punctuations used throughout the whole manuscript, sometimes it has two full stops, sometimes it lacks ')'.) 3. For all the Tables, there are several problems. Frist, as I understand, for each treatment, the author used three replicates, but they did not tell the reader how many plants they used in each replicate. Second, please uniform the 'SEM' and the SEM value should be displayed just after each mean value, for instance, 0.00 ± 0.00. In addition, what does CD(p=0.05)' mean? Please make it clear enough and give the full name of it, such that readers will easily catch the meaning. If it represents the p value, please also try a way to clear show the difference between each treatment, rather than just show the p value. 4. in the Results and Discussion part, the description of all the data is not clear enough, since the authors used nine treatments and the authors just described the T9 treatment and the similar outcomes of T6 and T8 treatments. What are the outcomes of the other treatments and the meaning of the other treatments? Please give more descriptions and interpretation of the data. Moreover, it is a little bit boring that every sentence started with similar description 'The treatment with spacing 50 X 15 cm and potassium application of 50 kg/ha K2O (T9) had the maximum plant height (161.43 cm) in comparison to other treatments. Two treatments T8 (161.10 cm) and T6 (159.93 cm) had comparable results to T9', if possible, please polish the language throughout the manuscript. 5. in the section 3.2.4, it is hard to understand such a long sentence 'Increased cob yield may be partly related ... high relative to the recommended spacing' , please polish it. 6. please uniform the 30 cm x 15 cm in the manuscript and all the Tables, it is not the letter 'X' but the character of multiply, one could simply insert the special multiply by the Word. 	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

Review Form 1.6

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:	Xianbo Zheng
Department, University & Country	Henan Agricultural University, China