

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_84859
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Different organic manures on growth parameter, yield, yield component and economics of Kharif Maize (Zea mays L.) on Eastern Plain Zone of Uttar Pradesh of Prayagraj Region
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>)

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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. In the title, “..growth performance, yield and economics of..” should replace “..growth parameter, yield, yield component and economics of..”2. The abstract was not informative enough, especially on the methodology employed in carrying out the experiment.3. This study has no research question neither does it has objective and or specific objective, which must be captured at the end of introduction.4. In materials and methods, the author gave no methodologies on how he arrived at some results of soil analysis stated in his research (i.e pH, Organic carbon, available nitrogen, available phosphorus and available potassium). Also the author did not state the plant parameters he measured in methodology. There were zero details on how the organic manures were sourced, prepared and/or applied.5. In results and discussion, tables were not presented in an appropriate way (table should be re-formatted to suit scientific table presentation). Furthermore, the tables have no legends to explain T₁ – T₉; C.D; SED etc. Results were not discussed properly (from multiple angle without being over interpreted). Finally, there were no methods on how productive parameters were measured.6. The first citation in this study (Maize outlook, 2018-19) was not referenced.	Corrected Revision made Done Revised
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. In line 1 and 2 of introduction, the statement that “corn is the world’s third most important cereal crop behind rice and wheat” should be cited.2. Nutrients composition of maize stated in the introduction should be cited (line 7, second paragraph).3. First time citation should not be abbreviated (line 16 of introduction).4. Citations should not be bolded.5. Most of the statements made by the author about organic manure types; their efficiencies, effectiveness and cost benefit must be cited.6. The author haven admitted that many researchers has worked on the three organic manures he used in this study, he ought to have stated their major nutrient composition. This would have been more informative.	Corrected
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The study is interesting but lack depth in literature which the author should work on. Finally, one major problem with this study is that it lacks specific objectives which distract the reader from knowing if the study answered the research questions that would have justified the entire research. However, it is something the author can address before the work is published.	

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>	