



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Experimental Agriculture International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_42738
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECT OF LIQUID DIGESTATE ON AGRICULTURAL SOIL – I: GROWTH DYNAMICS OF ZEA MAYS PLANT
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**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments	<p>Thank you for considering me to review the manuscript entitled "<i>Effect Of Liquid Digestate On Agricultural Soil – I: Growth Dynamics Of Zea Mays Plant</i>" I thoroughly went through the manuscript and found that author written it very well, carefully and explained with proper hypothesis. Author explained the role of application liquid digestate on agricultural soil and its effect on maize growth parameters. The research article gives insight about the role of various concentrations and time of application of liquid digestate on maize crop. Manuscript can be accepted for publication after minor revision, suggestions for author are listed here below:</p> <p><b>In abstract:</b> The quality of abstract is good; however some minor changes are needed. Please the upper and lowercase of the words. Write silent findings in brief of the treatment effect.</p> <p><b>Introduction</b> Introduction is very well written indicating about background and hypothesis of study, however, reduce the number of unnecessary reference in introduction part, please mentioned only recent cited references to justify the present study.</p> <p><b>Materials and methods:</b> There is lack of materials and method in the manuscript so please described the experimental set up in the manuscript. How to conduct experiment?? What the procedures you have adopted for successfully conducted the experiment??. how to determine the moisture content, pH, TOC, BOD, COD, and NH<sub>4</sub>, The total N. You have calculate the crop growth rate, please recheck the how to calculate the crop growth rate and also you should have mentioned the proper terminology, growth rate or crop growth rate (CGR). I thoroughly went through the manuscript and found that manuscript can be accepted for publication after minor revision, suggestions for the author are listed in reviewer form.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The abstract and introduction have been amended as directed by one of the reviewers.</li> <li>2. One of the reviewers also commented on the lack of procedures used to determine the physicochemical properties of the soil used to cultivate the maize plant. However, these procedures have been referenced. Describing them again will make the manuscript too voluminous. I suggest that the reader should consult the reference to get full description of the procedure of interest if need be.</li> <li>3. Rate of growth of <i>Zea mays</i> have been changed to "crop growth rate (CGR) of <i>Zea mays</i> as pointed out by one of the reviewers.</li> <li>4. The height and biomass of the maize were of interest that was why we did not feel the need to study other plant parameters.</li> </ol>
<b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments	<p>Growth dynamics include only growth rate in terms of the dry matter accumulation at different period/ stages, but there are another parameters such as RGR, LAI, leaf weight biomass, leaf area duration (LAD) also should analysed.</p> <p>Conclusion should be more elaborate with salient findings with concise manner.</p>	Finally, the paper has been check and corrected with respect to grammatical and spelling errors.
<b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments	<p>I appreciate the discussion part, the way author discussed the results with other findings is quite good. Also data interpretation and justification is very good, however, Results should be in highly structured and understandable to the readers English grammar and punctuation is poor throughout the manuscript which would require someone well versed in technical writing to edit. The study and accompanying results have merit but minor revisions are needed to make this manuscript worthy of publication,</p>	