



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Soil Science and Plant Nutrition
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJSSPN_42605
Title of the Manuscript:	Dry Matter Yield and NPK Uptake of Sweet Corn as Influenced by Fertilizer Application Grown under Conventional Tillage Operation at Bukidnon, Philippines
Type of the Article	Asian Journal of Soil Science and Plant Nutrition

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>)

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. - State the scientific name of sweet corn both in the title and abstract. - Keywords should not be part of the title and should be 8 in number. INTRODUCTION - Line 15-18 require citations since they are fundamental statements for your study. - Line 34-39 should be cut and copy pasted as the first paragraph in the introduction i.e. at line 14. - Knowledge gaps should be summarised below line 43. Materials and methods - Table 1 to be inserted at line 73. - Line 117-119 How did you determine the sample size of 10 plants?, There is a formulae for determining the sample size. - Statistical analysis; state the significance level for your study. REFERENCES. Serialize citations orderly from 1-27 as they appear in reference section. Ensure the citations used in the discussion of results feature in the background of your study.	- Sweet corn is a common experimental crop used. Putting its scientific name may somehow not anymore necessary. Thus, will make the title lengthier. - Second suggestion was well taken. - Citation was already given. - Knowledge gaps were clearly stated. - Table 1 was inserted. Well taken. - Significance of the study was stated in every tables below. - References were improved.