



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJEMT_32116
Title of the Manuscript:	"Energy Evaluation of Maize (Zea mays L.) under irrigated and un-irrigated conditions." Division of Agronomy-SKUAST Kashmir
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		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	I appreciated authors effort to evaluate Energy Evaluation of Maize (<i>Zea mays</i> L.) under irrigated and un-irrigated conditions.", but there are some major mistakes that in my review is below 1. Abstract need to revise with scientific values of each parameter variations with each combination. 2. There are many grammar mistakes which made confusion in understanding, its need to recheck whole manuscript. 3. Authors used lack of standard literature 4. Authors used some abbreviations but didn't explain once its meaning. 5. There is no comparative discussion and hierarchy between irrigated and un-irrigated conditions. 6. Author should add conclusion with study significance. 7. References need to recheck	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Sarfraz Hashim</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Department of Agricultural Engineering, Bahauddin Zakariya University, Multan, Pakistan</i>