Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JEAI_43836**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Productivity of Sweet Maize on Spikes under Previous Crops and Cropping Systems in the Coastal Tablelands of Sergipe Brazilian Northeast**
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	**TITLE: The title is very confusing. I suggest that authors leave the text shorter and more self-explanatory.** **ABSTRACT: Ok** **INTRODUCTION: L.26-28: Rephrase the sentence; L.31-32: Please, to reinforce this argument, cite in numbers the average loss of soil caused by erosion. L.42-47: To cite works that reinforce the benefits of the no-tillage system in each attribute. L.53: The authors cite benefits in the physical, chemical and biological properties of soil but do not mention what these properties are. Please, elucidate better for the reader. L.59-60: Please cite statistics that demonstrate the importance of maize to the state. Additionally, I suggest that the authors leave the working hypothesis clearer for readers.** **MATERIAL AND METHODS: L.61: It would be important to show a graph of the minimum and maximum temperature besides precipitation during the evaluation period. L.69: Please use an international soil classification system, such as the USDA classification model (http://soils.usda.gov/technical/classification/osd/index.html). L.75: The form of assessment should not be split plot with the previous crop management systems within the? L.77-78: What is the density of plants for cover crops? L.180: Replace "n, p and k," with "N, P, and K". L.104-105: this part should be presented last.** **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION: L.111: Productivity should be the last parameter presented! I suggest to reverse this order of presentation of the results. The items presented in acronyms should all be described when presented in the tables. Why not compare each crop in succession to the different management systems? I suggest doing this comparison to better elucidate the results found. L.117: I suggest to present these results in percentage.** **L. 144: What does "PD" mean? L.149: It would be very important for the authors to present the amount of macro and micronutrients cyclized by the crops in succession. L.184: Idem comment "L.69". L.245: Idem comment "L.111" (comparison of management systems for each plant attribute). I suggest that the authors make the Path Analysis for each system and culture in succession seeking to demonstrate that plant attribute more influence in the sweet maize productivity.** **CONCLUSIONS: The authors could include in the conclusions a recommendation for the sustainable cultivation of sweet corn for the Coastal Tablelands of Sergipe Brazilian Northeast based on data found in this work and in other works of the literature.** **REFERENCES: Ok**	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

SDI Review Form 1.6

Reviewer Details:

Name:	***Júnior Melo Damian***
Department, University & Country	***Department of Soil Science, University of São Paulo, Brazil***