



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2014_AJEA_11077
Title of the Manuscript:	How does transplant increase sweet maize (<i>Zea mays</i> L. <i>saccharata</i>) yield?
Type of the Article	Original Research 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	Suggested title: Yield increase as influenced by transplanting of sweet maize (<i>Zea mays</i> L. <i>saccharata</i>)	Title has been changed.																																																																						
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Effect the minor corrections e.g. on lines 26, 70, 74, 93 and all the tables as indicated review paper (SE±) a sample of a table is shown below <table><tr><td></td><td colspan="5">Plant height (cm plant⁻¹)</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>Variety</td><td>E-T</td><td>V₄</td><td>V₇</td><td>V_T</td><td>R₃</td><td>etc</td></tr><tr><td>'Canner'</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td>Direct</td><td>35.28a</td><td>43.04a</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td>Transplant</td><td>21.02b</td><td>26.26b</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td>SE±</td><td>?</td><td>?</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td>Butter sweet</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td>Direct</td><td>34.70a</td><td>39.65a</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td>Transplant</td><td>24.00b</td><td>27.55b</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td>SE±</td><td>?</td><td>?</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr></table>		Plant height (cm plant ⁻¹)						Variety	E-T	V ₄	V ₇	V _T	R ₃	etc	'Canner'							Direct	35.28a	43.04a					Transplant	21.02b	26.26b					SE±	?	?					Butter sweet							Direct	34.70a	39.65a					Transplant	24.00b	27.55b					SE±	?	?					Suggested corrections have been included. Hybrid is better than variety. If standard errors must be included in each table data would be more complex for readers. Anywhere, letters indicate significant differences and the ANOVA showed significant interactions between sources of variations.
	Plant height (cm plant ⁻¹)																																																																							
Variety	E-T	V ₄	V ₇	V _T	R ₃	etc																																																																		
'Canner'																																																																								
Direct	35.28a	43.04a																																																																						
Transplant	21.02b	26.26b																																																																						
SE±	?	?																																																																						
Butter sweet																																																																								
Direct	34.70a	39.65a																																																																						
Transplant	24.00b	27.55b																																																																						
SE±	?	?																																																																						



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The paper is good for publication	