

Editorial Comment:

The final decision for manuscript number 2017 JEAI 32574 entitled 'Effect of soil and foliar nitrogen application on growth, yield and quality of baby corn cultivars' written by MP Neupane, SP Singh, U Sai Sravan, and Abhishek Singh

Following evaluation of all documents related to the manuscript I have to ask the Authors for explanation of some issues.

1. There is written in the title, in abstract, and in Materials and methods (Table 1) that three cultivars (V1-V3) and six nitrogen application schedules (N1-N6) were investigated. Based on such information I predict that three cultivars were cultivated under six nitrogen application schedules. It should be 18 experimental variants of the research ($3 \times 6 = 18$). The problem is that there is only 9 experimental variants on Figures and in Tables. The results concerned cultivars and nitrogen application schedules are described (Results and Discussion) and presented separately (Figures and Tables). So, please precisely answer to the question: under what nitrogen application schedule(s) all three cultivars were cultivated? And the second question is: on which cultivar (V1, V2 or V3) all experiments concerned nitrogen application schedules (N1-N6) were performed?
2. It is written in Materials and methods that experiments were conducted during two growing seasons (2011-12 and 2012-13). So, what results are presented on Figures and in Tables? Are they averages from two years? If yes, it should be clearly written in figures and tables. The problem is that all error bars (SD or SE - not explained in the manuscript) are extremely low, so I guess that the results describes in the manuscript are not averages from two growing seasons, but only from one season. Additionally, there is no information about number of replications of the experiments and measurements.
3. The manuscript still contains many mistakes and ambiguities:
 - What does mean abbreviation/acronym DAS? It is not explained.
 - It should be clearly written what was the duration of the experiments. It should be added to Table 1 information in which day the developmental stages were reached. For example N1 – in which day of the experiment was the stage 'Knee high stage'. In N2 when was the 'Tassal emergence', etc.
 - What indicate the error bars on Figures?
 - Graphs on Figure 1, 2, and 3 cannot be a line graph. They must be a bar graph.
 - CONCLUSION is too long.
 - Two subsections are missing: COMPETING INTERESTS and AUTHORS' CONTRIBUTIONS.

Authors' Feedback:

1. The total experimental variants in this study were 18 (cultivars = 3, nitrogen schedules = 6 and total $3 \times 6 = 18$). Each of the cultivar was tested against each of the nitrogen schedules. Hence, there were a total of 18 treatment combinations. The figures and tables showing mean values obtained from two way tables (having 18 values for 18 treatment combinations). Further, such type of presentation of summary tables showing effect of the three cultivars and six nitrogen schedules is a standard statistical and commonly followed practice in journals of national and international repute. However, wherever interaction among two factors is found significant only there presenting the values of all the 18 treatment combinations is justified.
2. The pooled data for two growing seasons (2011-12 and 2012-13) have been presented in figures and tables and the same has been clearly indicated in all the figures and tables as per your suggestion. Further in tables standard error of mean is already given. However, error bars (indicate the standard error of mean) has been included in the concerned figures as suggested by you. As per your comments that all error bars are extremely low the size of the concerned figures have been enhanced considerably to make it more clear. Information about number of replication (three) is already given in L 44 to L 45 (in materials and methods) and the measurements have been given from L 57 to L 75.

3. The abbreviation DAS has been clarified at the first time use in L 54 and the duration of the crop during both the years has also been mentioned in L 54. Further, days taken to reach the developmental stages were not the needed parameters nor recorded during the study. However, other relevant parameters (CGR, RGR and 50% silk emergence) included in the study have been already included to show the relative performance of the treatments. The error bars in figures indicate standard error of the mean. Figure 1, 2 and 3 has been converted to a bar graph as per your suggestion. Conclusion has been reduced considerably as desired by you. The two subsections missing i.e. COMPETING INTERESTS and AUTHOR'S CONTRIBUTIONS have been added.