



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Experimental Agriculture International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_45594
Title of the Manuscript:	CHANGES IN CHEMICAL COMPOSITION AND NUTRITIVE VALUE DURING GRAIN DEVELOPMENT OF THREE VARIETIES OF MAIZE
Type of the Article	Original 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	1. There is no 'conclusion' for this article 2. 9 <sup>th</sup> line 'chemical compositon ' wrong spelling 3. table 3 appears before stated/ referred in the text 4. In Table 2 , Plant height and ear head statistical analysis is wrong. check.. The open pollinated variety (local white) recorded the highest plant height and ear height. Then why the means become 'c'. 5. In Table 3 ROW NUMBER statistical analysis is wrong 6. Check table 7. Specially, Mg, ZN, P levels. ??? are they mg/kg? 7. The following references were in the reference list but not in the text Lancey J (1998). 8.The following references were in the text but not in the reference list (Lancy, 1998). (Ingle, Bietz and Hageman 1965).	1. Conclusion now included 2. Corrected 3. Noted and corrected 4. Noted and corrected 5. Corrected 6. Mg/kg 7. Noted and corrected 8. Noted and corrected
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	Revisions has to be done as above comments	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		Thanks for your immeasurable contribution for the improvement of this paper.

**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)	All corrections made.