



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2014_AJEA_13172
Title of the Manuscript:	Transplant and a change in plant density improve sweet maize (Zea mays L.) 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	1. The choice of treatment was not adequate. Many groups of treatments (cultivars, densities and transplanting) were used and this made it difficult to interpret the results. There was an attempt to solve many problems at once and this hindered the achievement of objectives; 2. In sweet corn, the product quality is very important and it has not been evaluated. Maximum yields do not always provide the best return.	1. Reviewer 1 is not in agreement with this comment. On the other hand, we tested the effect of two implantation routines (direct-seeded and transplant), three plant densities and two cultivars. I don't understand why these variables interactions are wrong in the ANOVA tables. 2. Although maximum yield do not always provide the best return, there is a minimum ear fresh weight about 300 g/ear which assure a secure sale. On the other hand, ear quality based on it nutritional value is not a standard required for sailing.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1. The findings should have a direct and strong relationship with the research goals; 2. The Introduction chapter must have a logical sequence. The available literature should be better exploited; 3. Climate data do not represent results and therefore should not be included in Results; 4. Much of the text of the Discussion chapter is not discussion of results;	1. I think that results let to valid hypotheses and are strong related with the proposed objectives as it has been suggested by reviewer 1. 2. I consider that Introduction has a logical sequence. There is no other available literature between sweet maize transplant and plant density relationships. However, older papers on sweet maize transplant are included in Sánchez Andonova et al. (2014), American Journal of Agricultural Research, 4(11): 1314-1329 which it is included in the cited bibliography. 3. OK. Suggested changes have been made. 4. I am not in agreement with this comment. Each discussion paragraph has a direct relationship with data from the result section
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		