



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_37315
Title of the Manuscript:	Effects of different rates of plant nutrients on yield attributes and yield of Maize (Zea mays L.)
Type of the 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	Abstract Abstract should not exceed 300 words in length. Line 5: RSS, non-standard abbreviations should not be used in the abstract. Line 12: 12 treatment combinations is wrong, write 12 treatments combination Line 18: Precision [NPK + S (160, 60, 60, 40 kg / ha)] is not required. Key words (Plant nutrients, Yield attributes) must be different from those present in the title. You can use a word instead of a compound word or a synonym or another key words. Introduction Line 29-31: Reference (s)? Anonymous (2016) is absent in the references. Where is the general objective of the work? The introduction should end by the general objective of the study. Material and methods The origin (provenance) of plant material used in this study was not mentioned. Lines 83 and 91: Harmonizes the writing (20cm or 20 cm). But, it is preferable to write 20 cm. Line 111. The full stop at the end of the sentence is red. Why? It lacks details on experimental design: the size of the basic plot (basic/elementary unit), the number of blocks, etc. I would prefer two years of field data (major criticism) or experimentation at two different sites in the same year. Results an Discussion Lines 160 and 161. References are in red. Why? Line 161. Treatment T5 Treatment T5 Conclusions The conclusion part is absent in the manuscript. References References must be listed at the end of the manuscript and numbered in the order that they appear in the text. Every reference referred in the text must also present in the reference list and vice versa. In the text, citations should be indicated by the reference number in brackets [1]. Example: (Kumar et al., 2012) [1]. (Anonymous, 2016) [2], etc.. Anonymous (2013) is absent in the text. Seepat and Rai (2013) in the text, but Seepat and Rai (2013) in the references Paramasivan et al. (2012) in the text, but Paramasivan et al. (2012) in the references.	In abstract I correct all the mistakes you incorporated. In introduction reference is added as your recommendation. Origin is mentioned and another mistake is corrected. Red full-stop is written mistakenly. Experiment designs are mentioned and size of plot mentioned. Red reference is written mistakenly Space given. Conclusion is mentioned as per you're your requirement. References Are written as per your requirements. Spellings are corrected.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	References are poorly written. Authors must follow the journal guidelines for writing references. Example: Hilly M, Adams ML, Nelson SC. A study of digit fusion in the mouse embryo. Clin Exp Allergy. 2002;32(4):489-98. Rang HP, Dale MM, Ritter JM, Moore PK. Pharmacology. 5th ed. Edinburgh: Churchill Livingstone; 2003. Beers MH, Porter RS, Jones TV, Kaplan JL, Berkwits M, editors. The Merck manual of diagnosis and therapy. 18th ed. Whitehouse Station (NJ): Merck Research Laboratories; 2006. Glennon RA, Dukat M. Serotonin receptors and drugs affecting serotonergic neurotransmission. In: Williams DA, Lemke TL, editors. Foye's principles of medicinal chemistry. 5th ed. Philadelphia: Lippincott Williams & Wilkins; 2002.	
Minor REVISION comments	English syntax errors have been detected in the text. Re-reading of the manuscript is recommended. The conclusion is a mandatory part of the manuscript. Authors must respect the instructions to the authors.	Your recommendation are accepted and incorporated in manuscript.
Optional/General comments		