



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_44727
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of the effect of three types of fertilizer on the agronomic potential of a hybrid variety of maize (Zea mays L.), grown in Korhogo commune in Côte d'Ivoire
Type of the Article	1. Original research papers

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>)

La politique de révision par les pairs de ce journal stipule qu'AUCUN manuscrit ne doit être rejeté que sur la base du «manque de nouveauté», à condition que le manuscrit soit scientifiquement solide et techniquement valable.

Pour connaître la ligne directrice complète relative au processus d'examen par les pairs, les examinateurs sont invités à consulter le lien suivant:



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	The manuscript is accepted with minor changes. It has scientific quality and good support statistical. The parameters evaluated are adequate. Only few errors were founded during the revision. Title: Is ok Abstract: Is ok, only line 11 write Northern and line 19 write Control yield (5972 kg/ha). Introduction: Write the economic importance of corn production in Cote d'Ivoire. (Annual production, production value and acreage). Line 41. Write South. Line 56 write kg/ha not Kg/ha. Materials and methods: Line 69. Write North and West. Section 2.3. Fertilizer products (Lines 89 to 97) is repetitive with 2.4. Methods (lines 106 to 110). In this type of experiment is very necessary write the chemical and physical properties of the soil. Results: Is ok. Tables 1, 2 and 3 are clear and good explication. Improve Figure 1. Discussion: Is ok. Only line 294 reference Vilain, 1997 is lacking inside reference list. Check. Line 400. The reference is Grantz et al. or Grant et al. Check. Conclusion: Is ok. References: Is ok.	Abstract: Corrected Introduction Corrected Materials and methods Corrected Lines 89 to 97 (this section concerns applied treatments) Results Corrected Discussion Corrected
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	There's no ethical issues in this manuscript.