



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_50317
Title of the Manuscript:	Physiological basis of yield differences in quality protein maize genotypes of different maturity groups
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments		
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	. Field experiment was conducted as randomized complete block design (RCBD) with three replicates at Institute of Agricultural Research and Training, Obafemi Awolowo University, Moor Plantation, Ibadan during 2013 and 2014 cropping seasons. The results indicated that season influenced days to 50% Anthesis (DTA), days to 50% silking (DTS), anthesisilking interval (ASI) plant height (PLHT), ear height (EHT), root lodging (RTL), shoot lodging (STL), ear per plant (EPP), ear aspect (EASP), kernel width (KWDT) and grain yield (GYD). Maturity groups also influenced DTA, DTS, PASP, PLHT, EHT, and STL with no effect on GYD. The overall mean grain yields across storage were 4.44, 4.16, 3.64 and 3.36 t/ha for 0, 3, 9 and 15 months in storage, respectively. It was concluded from this study that all the maturity groups used had comparable grain yield	NOTED

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)	