



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2015_AJEA_16159
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of integrated nutrient management on growth and yield of Sweet corn (Zea mays L. saccharata)
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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

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	Abstract - Abstract needs to be improved. In fact we could not get significant informations from the Abstract. There is lack of information regarding treatments. What are the treatments used in this study?? What is T(10) means??? what is T(3) and T(2) in abstract??? Could be more attracted as T₂, T₃??? - Add some significant results in Abstract instead if saying parameters. For examples, give LAI values, CGR values????? - Some sentences should be rephrased and shortened. For example "The growth and yield response of sweet maize (Zea mays (L.) saccharata) to varying levels of organic and inorganic fertilizers during the growing seasons of kharif 2010 and 2011 was studied under temperate conditions at Experimental Farm of Division of Agronomy at main campus of Sher-e-Kashmir University of Agricultural Sciences and Technology of Kashmir, Shalimar, Srinagar." Materials and Methods - What is PBS?? Avoid abbreviations directly. First add detail and then use abbreviation. Same is the case for rest of paper. - Add "and" experiment was laid out in" at the end of experimental treatment details. - Knee high or knee hight???????	The comments are acceptable. Therefore I had revised the manuscript as per the reviewers suggestions The comments are acceptable and changes done The comments are acceptable and the sentences have been shortened. Full form of PSB included Done as per comment It is Knee high, as present in manuscript



SDI Review Form 1.6

	• Can authors use ore common units like Kg ha⁻¹ or tonnes ha⁻¹? • Delete the repeated sentences like "Where, W1 = Dry weight of plant at time t1, W2 = Dry weight of plant at time t2" also give t2 timings?? • Authors discussed a lot T(10) T(9) etc in abstract, results however they just give treatment detail in conclusion??? It would be better to use T(10) T(9) etc in conclusion also. • There are 12 Figures??? Why not cite them Figure 1 to 12???? • If T9 or T10 or T11 are at par with T12?? why not recommend these other than T10????	Done Done Done as per comment No doubt T10 is at par with T9 and T11, However, among these three treatments the highest mean was found in T10. That is why it was recommended for further investigation at multilocations along with T9 and T11 to arrive at final recommendations.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Article needs some strong arguments in discussion. Add some significant result in abstract. There should be Figure 1, 2 3 ,etc instead of Figure 1a to L. It would be better to give treatment details in One table for more easiness of readers.	The manuscript has been revised as per the reviewer's suggestions.