



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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The topic should read evaluation of the phenol production potential of maize (Zea mays L.) in response to infection caused by <i>Fusarium verticillioides</i> (Niren.). 2. In line 68, please, explain in detail (step by step procedure) how subculturing was done. 3. In line 79, you mentioned that maize seeds were surface sterilized in a beaker containing (3.5%w/v) of sodium chloride. This concentration is too high and can kill the seeds. Please, reduce the concentration to 1% or 5% to enhance seed viability. 4. You need to state in detail (step by step procedure) how the phenol content of the sample was determined clearly indicating the formula. 5. Make compulsory grammatical corrections in the entire manuscript. 6. Arrange the manuscript according to the journal specifications. 	The topic has been corrected in response to examiners comments. Subculturing process has been re-written. The 3.5% hypochlorite was a typographical error and has been corrected. Procedures on phenol production has been inserted. Grammatical errors corrected and manuscript arranged according to specification
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	Good work by authors.	

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)	