



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Experimental Agriculture International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_49309
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of nitrogen rates on the forage yield of maize genotypes under superadhesion
Type of the 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>)

**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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	Studies of this nature contribute positively to a scenario of rural production especially when they are linked to family agriculture with the possibility of increasing income and offering a quality product for market inertia. According to the results, the corn genotypes Viçosense, Branca and Nordestino, for the productive and qualitative characteristics of the forage studied, demonstrated an important performance, except for the variable HC, where the White genotype stood out in relation to the others, presenting the highest levels of hemicelluloses, which gives it the highest concentrations of energy and digestibility of its fodder; (b) the dose of 80 kg ha <sup>-1</sup> of nitrogen was the most satisfactory for the productive and qualitative characteristics of maize forage, since its effect was similar to the increase of nitrogen doses, besides providing a higher percentage of NDF.	All this was rightly observed during the analysis of the experiment. The genotypes had a good forage performance, and the dose of 80 kg per hectare of nitrogen gave the best results in term of forage quantity as well as its quality.
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	X	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	X	

**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 are no ethnic issues in this work