



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2014_AJEA_10802
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECTS OF CLIMATE CHANGE CRITICAL FACTORS ON THE SEEDLING GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT OF MAIZE (<i>Zea mays L.</i>)
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

	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	There are minor grammatical errors in English. Please read it through for accuracy or have a native English speaker give it a quick edit. The variety of maize is not mentioned on page 7. To be reproducible, the authors must report the cultivar. The differences between SN, DN and WN are not really explored. The objective of the study is to compare differences of water, temperature, soil and light. Yet I get no comparative graphs or any sense of interaction between the independent variables. These need to be added. The results of the ANOVA are only slightly reported. Where is the test for interaction between factors? And the significance testing? The study must include better reporting of the results. The conclusion section should recap the main findings and point to future research needs. Please do this.	Accepted Has been indicated The factors cannot be discussed separately, they interact together to influence the environment. The tables are showing enough comparison. Accepted
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	. Page 2, line 41: change "include" to "including" . Page 3, line 58: change "Temperature range" to "The temperature range" . Page 3, line 71: Please change "Response of plant" to "The response of"	Accepted Accepted Accepted

	plants”. And doesn’t it also depend of the type of plant too? - Page 2: The authors write “The over-riding climatic factor is temperature, and it is by this that the world is divided into its major climatic zones of which the tropic is one. However, within the tropics rainfall is the most important climatic factor.” I think it’s better to just say precipitation and temperature are the dominant factors governing crop growth. - Page 4, starting line 86: I’m not sure why this paragraph is here. I might suggest removing this paragraph if the article needs to be shortened. - Page 6, starting line 118: I think this paragraph is redundant with the previous, and I suggest removing it. - Page 6, line 129: please change “three most ecological” to “three most ecologically” - Page 10, line 191: do you mean maximum temperature was 36.35°C? I don’t think any maize cultivar could long survive if the temperature was maintained that hot day and night. Or is it average daytime temperature? Please clarify the temperature here and in Table II.	Accepted Accepted Average daytime temperature
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	I think there are good benefits to this work being published, but the reporting of the data and the analysis fall short. As a result, I can’t tell if there is anything new or useful here. There simply isn’t enough information about the significance other than standard deviations Here’s an example of significance reporting that might be of use: http://academiapublishing.org/ajb/pdf/2013/Oct/Shaddad%20et%20al.pdf	