



SDI Review Form 1.6

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name: | Journal of Experimental Agriculture International |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_JEAI_48808 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Phenol Production In Maize (Zea mays L.) in Response To Infection Caused By Fusarium verticillioides (Niren.). |
| 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 | <p>Lots of editing needed: see track-changes ms</p> <p>lincrease in height over the growth period does not justify a level of significance; what would be important and should be measured is the effect of disease on height vs control. Few if any of the tables and graphs tell the actual source of data; ie.what treatments were included in the averages and other statistical analysis. For many it is likely the endpoint values, but this in snot clear.</p> <p>Values such as these cannot be described realistically to the second decimal.</p> <p>Some of the 'significant' values such s number of leaves seem to be simply variety or age related; again the comparisons should only be for changes associated with infection.</p> <p>The discussing makes claims for 'prrofs' not shown in the ms. See Highlighted statements.</p> | <p>Editings have been done as far as possible.</p> <p>Comparisons were made among the varieties.</p> <p>Source of data were mentioned under data collection and analysis.</p> <p>The ANOVA table bear the F statistics that show the level of contribution (significance) of each variable.</p> <p>The results in Table 6 was not just an average of 4 treatments, but part of an output of the raw data (in replicates) after analysis using the GLM option of SAS.</p> <p>Explanation on result in Table 7 cannot be given under result but under discussion.</p> |
| Minor REVISION comments | | |
| Optional/General comments | <p>It would perhaps help if all the averages for each variety for each treatment combination were available in a table- maybe not for every week, but at least those where conclusions are being drawn.</p> | <p>All raw data were fed in to SAS, which engaged the Generalized Linear Model option (GLM) for the analysis. The averages were not calculated separately. This is where the fitted model came in.</p> |

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) | |