



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	MS: 2012_AJEA_2914
Title of the Manuscript:	EVIDENCE OF IMPROVING YIELD AND MORPHOLOGICAL ATTRIBUTES VIA HALF-SIB FAMILY RECURRENT SELECTION IN MAIZE.

General guideline for Peer Review process is available in this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

- This form has total 9 parts. Kindly note that you should use all the parts of this review form.



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2: 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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	This manuscript describes a recurrent selection experiment that probably would provide good information for maize breeders in Pakistan. In its current form it is not suitable for publication. This is primarily because it is not possible to determine what procedures were actually done in preparation for the field experiments. The statistical methods and the data analysis is probably correct, but it is not possible to determine if the conclusions are correct, because I was not able to determine how the experiment was done. Also, before publication someone needs to do a thorough critique of the English used. I will provide some examples of needed revision from the introduction. But I did not make any suggestions beyond the Materials and Methods.	Thanks for comments the correction have been incorporated in manuscript.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Line 41: Change assessed to determined Line 42: Change will produce to will be produced Line 55: Change required to requires Lines 58-60: Delete sentence beginning with "Several" Line 66: Change though to through A comma after "first" Change maintaining to maintenance Line 69: Change increase to increased Line 71: Change develop to developed	All the suggested corrections have been incorporated in the manuscript.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Line 72: Change experiment to experimentation Line 74: Insert “production” before “per” Line 75: Begin a new paragraph Line 87: Delete sentence beginning with “Identification” Line 89: Change were to was Lines 94 to 116: Shouldn’t lines actually be families. Using the word line implies some inbreeding. If they are actually lines, the we need to know how they were derived. Line 101: What was the “composite male”? Line 105: Begin a new paragraph. Line 154: What materials were Cycle 0 and Cycle 1. Was the base population grown in both years. There is an implication that some kind of selection was done after year one. If so, did you test only the selected lines in year two? In the results you show progress from selection, but no selection procedures are described. Cycle 1 implies that you selected materials in Cycle 0 and recombined them to get Cycle 1. That may be what you did initially, but it is not clear from the Materials and Methods. If you grew all materials in both years, then you could combine over years. Since that was not done, suggests that the materials grown in year 1 were not the same as those grown in year 2. If that is the case, then we need to know how you selected the materials to grow in year 2. Without good information about how the experiment was done, the results and discussion can not be evaluated. I suspect that the scientists did a good and interesting selection experiment. But I’m unable to evaluate in the way it is currently presented.	
--	---	--