



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>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	<p>Reviewer's comment This manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. The Topic, Introduction, Materials and Methods, Results, Discussion, 3 Tables, Conclusion and References could all be re-written to meet the required standard for this Journal (JEAL).</p>	<p>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)</p>
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The REFERENCES written after the 5. CONCLUSION (Lines 173 to 225) were not put in the format acceptable by this Journal – with Year of publication below and not put in brackets. 2. 3. RESULTS and 4. DISCUSSION (Lines 104 to 166) could have been written systematically, based mainly on the 3 Tables given in this research work. That is data given in the 3 Tables were not followed and discussed systematically as much as possible. These could need to be re-done. 	<p>Correction done As suggested by the reviewer</p>
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p>	<p>Few of the corrections pointed out could also be effected along with others -</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>Keywords: Maturity group, agronomic traits, Zea mays genotypes, grain yield.</i> 2. Lines 15 and 16: Could delete - root lodging (RTL), shoot lodging (STL), 3. In Line 18: across the 4 seasons were 4. Line 19: 3.36 t/ha for seasons 1, 2, 3 and 4, respectively. 5. Line 20: Could change - had comparable grain yield. To had similar grain yield. 6. Lines 24 to 25: several agro-ecologies during different cropping seasons. 7. Line 33: late maturing varieties out-yielded the early maturing varieties by 27 to 40% [5]. The extra-early and early maturing 8. Line 44: counterparts. 9. Line 60: indepth 10. Line 65: namely, early, intermediate and late maturity groups. 11. Line 67: processing, preliminary evaluation of seed quality were done and the remaining seeds 12. Line 68: in a cool room 13. Line 72: 2.2 Experimental layout and cultural practices 14. Line 75: the 12 genotypes with 3 replications. 15. Line 82: immediately after planting. This was 	<p>Correction made were all marked in red ink Between line 98 and 99- All the trait measured were listed under data collection.. Line 136- Stating results under discussion may not be fantastic, i think??.</p> <p>Every other corrections have all been attended to</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>16. Line 97: shelled and percentage moisture at harvest was determined</p> <p>17. Line 98: Grain yield (GYD) at 13% moisture content was used</p> <p>18. Between Lines 98 and 99: Could mention or list out all the 10 flowering, morphological and productivity traits on which data were collected under Tables 1, 2 and 3; that is from DTA to GYD.</p> <p>19. Line 99: Could put - 2.4 Data analysis</p> <p>20. Line 100: across the different maturity groups. All analysis</p> <p>21. Line 101: of the statistical analysis system (SAS) software</p> <p>22. Line 102: compute mean squares</p> <p>23. Line 103: Range Test (DMRT) of same statistical package</p> <p>24. Line 104: 3. RESULTS</p> <p>25. Between Line 104 and 105: Could put sub-heading - 3.1 Mean square values of agronomic characters of 12 maize genotypes</p> <p>22. Lines 105 to 106: (ANOVA) were significantly ($p < 0.01$) different. Season effect on flowering traits were days</p> <p>23. Line 110: maturity was negligible</p> <p>24. Line 112: each maturity group VAR(MAT) was only</p> <p>25. Line 113: of S x MAT was significant</p> <p>26. Between Lines 113 to 114: Could mention what Rep (Season) imply</p> <p>27. Line 117 to 118: two seasons (1 and 2) ; last 2 seasons (3 and 4)</p> <p>28. In Lines 120 to 123: Could have quoted most of the values in Table3. Eg. The early-maturing varieties had a mean DTA of 51.5 days, while Intermediate and late had higher values of 54.7 days and 54.2 days.</p> <p>29. Line 124 to 125: ear height values of 61.1 and 55.5 cm, which were lower than ; late maturing varieties (64.4 cm).</p> <p>30. Line 126: had no significant differences</p> <p>31. Line 127: 4. DISCUSSION</p> <p>32. In Line 130: Could delete - and amount (Data not shown)</p> <p>33. Line 136: Could effect as in Lines 120 to 123</p> <p>34. Line 144to 145: Number of days recorded ---</p> <p>35. Line146: during the planting seasons were similar $p > 0.05$.</p> <p>36. Lines 148 to 149: Could delete sentence – not shown in the Tables (lodging)</p> <p>37. Line 157: that some genotypes were late to maturity</p> <p>38. Line 168: Could put the physiological traits in brackets</p> <p>39. Line 170: Could change Comparable to similar</p>	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>40. Line 186: Could change Legion to Legon 41. Lines 213 and 217: Could put names of town and country if possible 42. Under headings in Tables 1, 2 and 3 could delete – at the Research Farm of the Institute of Agricultural Research and Training (IAR&T), Obafemi Awolowo University, Ibadan 43. In Table 1 – Could put – Season (S); Maturity (MAT); S X MAT ; 44. In Table 1 – Could following to Footnotes : S – Season; MAT – Maturity; VAR(MAT) – Variety within maturity group; Rep (Season) ??? ; S X MAT – Interactive effect of season and maturity ; 45. In Tables 1 2 and 3 could delete - RTL - Root Lodging; STL- Shoot Lodging; - using Duncan’s multiple range test. - EH/PH- Ratio of Ear Height over Plant Height; - In Tables 2 and 3. Means with different letters in each column are significantly different at P< 0.05</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments .</p>	<p>Correction could be effected by studying previous similar articles from reputable Journals</p>	<p>NOTED</p>

PART 2:

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