



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Crop Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCS_50313
Title of the Manuscript:	Improving Maize Yield and Nitrogen Use Efficiency Using Spectral Properties of Leaves for Need-Based Nitrogen Management
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

	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	<p>Lines were numbered</p> <p>Line 37 - not a sentence</p> <p>Line 112 Thousand grain weight not 1000 grain weight to start a sentence</p> <p>Line 117 Days to tasseling and days to silk emergence should be calculated in heating degree unit so the effect can be compared across years and locations</p> <p>Line 128 micro-Kjeldahl will not detect nitrate which will accumulate in the lower stalk at high N fertility</p> <p>Line 166 The F values from analysis of variance for main effects (cultivar and N management) and interaction (cultivar x N management) must be displayed before any interactive effects can be claimed. Based on error bars of figure 2 the cultivars all responded similarly to N management, ie no interactive effects. If your interaction is based on LSD, I would suggest that might be a false positive.</p> <p>Line 168 Not relevant without a significant interactive F value from ANOVA. This whole paragraph needs to be struck.</p> <p>Line 182 Table 2 there was an average deviation of 6.96% when kernel cob⁻¹ was calculated by multiplying row cob⁻¹ with kernels row⁻¹ verses stated kernels cob⁻¹. Seems like a lot of variation in reporting</p> <p>Titles should be cob⁻¹ and row⁻¹ rather than per cob or per row.</p> <p>Line 191 The plant N analysis is flawed because nitrate nitrogen is not included in these analyses. Up to 20% of the total N at higher N fertilities can be stalk nitrate in the lower stalk. Stalk nitrate increases with increased N fertilities so without accounting for nitrate in the tissue samples, and since the sub plot is differences in N management (fertility) you may be underestimating the N taken up in the N managements that included higher fertility.</p> <p>Line 243 No interaction demonstrated</p> <p>Line 274 Chart not Chat</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Dale Loussaert
Department, University & Country	USA