SCIENCEDOMAIN *international*
www.sciencedomain.org

SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_CJAST_39600**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Productivity of Sweet corn as Influenced by Planting Geometry and Fertilizer Levels**
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)

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 paper is important to improve the productivity of sweet corn cultivation The paper has no hypothesis or work objectives. In the experiment the variables to study are three planting densities and three doses of fertilizer NPK, in these three the dose of K is the same for which there is only one level of this fertilizer and only NP varies. The soil analysis data indicate low values of Zn and Fe, these nutrients were not applied, so it is not known if they can mask or limit the response to the other nutrients applied. Statistical methods are not presented to evaluate the results, nor are the analyzes shown. The interpretation of the results and the conclusions has no scientific basis, since there is no statistical analysis of the data that supports the statements made. It is also not known whether there are interaction effects between planting densities and the application of fertilizers. In the comparison of different density, a treatment has a different distance between rows, so the geometry of the plantation changes, to be able to compare it with the others it should have treatments where the geometry varies and not the density, in order to evaluate this variable.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	The paper has several shortcomings from the experimental design, analysis of results, which is why you should rework the work to the information obtained. The causes of the results obtained are not known, the higher yield is due to a variation in density, plant geometry and / or application of NPK, the dose of two NP nutrients was varied, it is not known which one is attributed the greatest response percentage or if it is an interaction of both?	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	***Martín Maria Silva Rossi***
Department, University & Country	***Argentina***