



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Soil Science and Plant Nutrition
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJSSPN_33573
Title of the Manuscript:	YIELD AND BIOMASS RESPONSES OF MAIZE (Zea mays) TO THE APPLICATION OF FOLIAR FERTILIZERS
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	<p>New Title: <u>Responses of early growth of maize (Zea mays L.) to foliar fertilizers application in hydroponics environment.</u></p> <p>Abstract: Remove all the subtitles. Include quantitative results of significant findings.</p> <p>Introduction: Address the title issues properly and include problem of study and justification. Relevant references of previous and recent studies relating to this one should be mention. Your objective one with respect to levels or rates of nutrient application was not carried out. Object three was not presented and discussed.</p> <p>Materials and methods: Recast the "experimental details" to "materials and methods". The MM lacks details for further replication of the study elsewhere. Experimental treatments and design (CRD, RBCD, Factorial...) not properly stated. In your statistical analysis, details of statistical software was not mentioned. Delete figures 1-5 as there're neither presented as results nor discussions. Only quantitative figures (graph, bar chart, etc) are important.</p> <p>Results and discussion: Present quantitative results, refer to tables or figures in question. Compare the results with at least seven previous and current studies.</p>	<p>The title has been rewritten to reflect the reviewer's comment. All subtitles have been removed coupled inclusion of more quantitative results. The introduction has been restructured to include relevant details as suggested by the reviewer.</p> <p>The details of the replication employed in the study was clearly discussed. We employed SPSS for the analysis which has now been included in the article. All figures have been deleted.</p> <p>The result has been re-discussed considering the reviewer's comment. Also, the conclusion has been recast in a concise structure. More references added.</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>Was there no other studies similar to this one? What was their findings How does your result agree or disagree, give reasons for the deviation(s). Figures 7-10 should be 1-4. From the result figures presented, no statistics shown. Following the objective, you are expected to show results of shoot length, stem girth and leaf area alongside with root length. You mentioned in lines 255-256 that "Foliar fertilizer is very effective at early growth stage...". This is not enough stage to judge. The study should include amongst others, DMY of biomass (shoots: stems and leaves), nutrient concentrations and nutrient uptake. Discussion: Recast and discuss according to either subtitles or objectives. Conclusion and recommendations: Delate paragraphs 1 & 2 and reframe the last two into the conclusion and recommendation. References: Too few. Reference number 7 is out of place in this study.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	Clearly define the experimental treatments, experimental design, data collection, methods and instrument used for data collection and their units.	Experimental design and data collection are now well clearly spelt out to reflect reviewer's comment.
Optional/General comments		