



**SDI EDITORIAL COMMENTS FORM**

EDITORIAL COMMENT'S on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to editor's comments
<p>The manuscript can be accepted. However, the author should be more elaborate on the justification of this study.</p> <p>For example:</p> <p><b>Line 60 in the introduction reads: "However, in Eswatini, maize spacing recommendation of 44,444 plants ha<sup>-1</sup> (90 cm × 25 cm) has been used since long time [14]"</b></p> <p><b>The conclusion reads in line 326 reads: "Thus, it can be concluded that medium maturing variety PAN 53 and plant density of 44444 plants/ha are best treatments to maximize the productivity of maize in the study area."</b></p> <p>In justifying the study the author should point out key differences between the varieties which were developed long ago as the author stated, and the ones currently grown. Why he/ she re-evaluated plant density, should clearly be explained since it was already known as 44,444 plants ha<sup>-1</sup>.</p>	<p><i>There was a feeling that since morphologically smaller and quicker maturing varieties have been introduced, it is time we revisit the densities we have been using since colonial times.</i></p> <p><i>It turns out the current population of 44444 plants/ha still stands. Hence we re-endorse those earlier recommendations. Some minor changes have been made though.</i></p> <p><i>Some attributes of the newer varieties have been taken care from line 54</i></p>