



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>)



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	Lines 7-22. - Use different sub-section names (Aims, Study design, Place and Duration of the Study, Methodology, Results and Conclusion), as given in the MS word SDI paper template. Lines 11, 68. Commune: council is better Line 17. 12373 kg/ha 12,373 kgha⁻¹ Line 18. 6560 kg/ha for PBA and 9153 kg/ha 6,560 kgha⁻¹ for PBA and 9,153 kgha⁻¹ Line 24. -Put keywords alphabetically! - Keywords should be inclined (italicized) - Key words (Maize, Côte d'Ivoire) must be different from those present in the title. You can use a word instead of a compound word, a synonym or another key words. 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 be present in the reference list and vice versa. In the text, citations should be indicated by the reference number in brackets []. Ex. (Hoopen and Maïga, 2012) should be replaced in the text by [1]; (Pieri, 1989) by [2]; (FAO, 2005) by [3]; etc. Line 56. 4000 to 6000 Kg/ha ... 800 Kg/ha 4,000 to 6,000 kgha⁻¹ ... 800 kgha⁻¹ Line 67. Locality of study : It is better to write "Study site" or "study area" Line 74. 1100 and 1600 mm ... 2600 hours 1,100 and 1,600 mm ... 2,600 hours Line 80. The provenance (place of obtention) of plant material used in this study was not mentioned Line 81. t / ha, t ha⁻¹, Line 90. fertilizer. It is: fertilizer: Lines 111-123. On what base did you choose the dose of each fertilizer applied? Line 152. Ascending Hierarchical Classification (AMP???) Line 159. does not reveal did not reveal Line 166. Where is the first group? Line 168. The first group should appears before the second. Line 192. What is the measure unit of leaf area? cm or cm²? Line 205. 12373 kg / ha 12,373 kg ha⁻¹ Lines 205-206. the first group consists of by??? the averages Lines 210-211. This treatment gave the lowest averages at for these different parameters. Line 211. 5972 kg / ha 5,972 kg ha⁻¹ Line 226. the results show showed no difference Line 261,272. Plane plan Lines 284-404. Some references used are old and therefore should be updated. Line 325. elements. (Remove the point). Line 327. and microbial activity, d an ?? insolubilization Line 155. 3. RESULTS 3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION 3.1 Results Line 156. 3.1. Effect of different types of... 3.1.1 Effect of different types of... Line 195. 3.2. Effect of different types... 3.1.2 Effect of different types... Line 231. 3.3. Study of correlations between variables 3.1.3 Study of correlations between variables Line 259. 3.4. Distribution of treatments and...	Notes taken into account and corrected Corrected Notes taken into account and corrected Notes taken into account and corrected Corrected Corrected Corrected updated references Corrected Corrected Corrected



SDI Review Form 1.6

	3.1.4 Distribution of treatments and... Line 284. 4. DISCUSSION 3.2 Discussion Line 406. 5. Conclusion 4. CONCLUSION Lines 406-419. What are the prospects of this study? (perspective Line 409. compared to the non-fertilizer control. Lines 414-417... improved production characteristics and yield???? (Reformulate!) Line 418. It's unpleasant to start a sentence with "because" (Reformulate!) Line 421. BIBLIOGRAPHIC REFERENCES REFERENCES Lines 192, 254, 257, 282. - Table 1: Table 1. Table 2: Table 2. Table 3: Table 3. Figure 1: Fig. 1. - Figures/Tables titles should be in bold - Correct the writing of numbers with decimals! Replace the comma with the dot/point! Lines 193-194, 255. Figure/Table legends should be inclined (italicized) Line 407. mineral fertilizer (Yara) has had... Lines 422-515. References are poorly written. Authors must follow the guidelines for writing references.	Observations taken into account and corrected
Minor REVISION comments	This article is not well written. Guidelines for the article presentation of the journal and MS word SDI paper template must be taken into account by the authors. English syntax errors have been detected in the text. Vocabulary and grammar should be revised. Re-reading of the manuscript is strongly recommended.	We noted the remarks made by the corrector. Therefore, we have done the best to correct these errors committed in writing. Thank you for your relevant 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.