



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEA_21654
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of irrigation water requirement of maize crop for different tillage practice in Bangladesh
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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	The shortfall of this article lies in the manner in which the author has arranged his\her treatments and their combinations. This was done in a very confusing and complicated manner which make them not understandable to the readers or the end user of the information. This section is very important and must be drafted in a manner that it can be repeated by someone who want to validate the findings. The results of this study were nor discussed, i.o.w, there is no discussion. The literature review is very limited and weak yet there is a plenty of information about the topic in question. The results of the study must be discussed and supported with relevant references. I suggest that the author re do the methodology and discussion section thoroughly since this are the most important section of the article	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Anonymous
Department, University & Country	Agricultural Research Council, South Africa