



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2014_AJEA_13594
Title of the Manuscript:	Direct Seeded and Transplanted Maize: Effects of Planting Date and Age of Seedling on the Yield and Yield Attributes
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 <i>(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)</i>																																						
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments																																								
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	There are some minor corrections in the lines mentioned below; <table><thead><tr><th><u>Line</u></th><th><u>Correction</u></th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td>17</td><td>difference</td></tr><tr><td>71</td><td>number of grain(s)</td></tr><tr><td>72</td><td>Harvest area (of).....</td></tr><tr><td>79</td><td>number of grain(s)</td></tr><tr><td>85</td><td>The highest length of cobs was recorded for the 20 November planting</td></tr><tr><td>88</td><td>cob diameter having (the highest).....</td></tr><tr><td>90</td><td>grain row(s)</td></tr><tr><td>91</td><td>Number of cob(s)</td></tr><tr><td>110</td><td>number of grain(s)</td></tr><tr><td>111</td><td>in respect (to all yield components)</td></tr><tr><td>115</td><td>number of grain(s)</td></tr><tr><td>122</td><td>number of grain(s)</td></tr><tr><td>126</td><td>from direct (seeding)</td></tr><tr><td>128</td><td>while (the) lowest</td></tr><tr><td>149 & 160</td><td>in both varieties</td></tr><tr><td>184</td><td>The combination D₂X21-d produced</td></tr><tr><td>222</td><td>difference(s)</td></tr><tr><td>228</td><td>subsequent</td></tr></tbody></table> **N.B. letters between brackets are the corrected ones	<u>Line</u>	<u>Correction</u>	17	difference	71	number of grain(s)	72	Harvest area (of).....	79	number of grain(s)	85	The highest length of cobs was recorded for the 20 November planting	88	cob diameter having (the highest).....	90	grain row(s)	91	Number of cob(s)	110	number of grain(s)	111	in respect (to all yield components)	115	number of grain(s)	122	number of grain(s)	126	from direct (seeding)	128	while (the) lowest	149 & 160	in both varieties	184	The combination D ₂ X21-d produced	222	difference(s)	228	subsequent	Corrections were made accordingly at all lines mentioned.
<u>Line</u>	<u>Correction</u>																																							
17	difference																																							
71	number of grain(s)																																							
72	Harvest area (of).....																																							
79	number of grain(s)																																							
85	The highest length of cobs was recorded for the 20 November planting																																							
88	cob diameter having (the highest).....																																							
90	grain row(s)																																							
91	Number of cob(s)																																							
110	number of grain(s)																																							
111	in respect (to all yield components)																																							
115	number of grain(s)																																							
122	number of grain(s)																																							
126	from direct (seeding)																																							
128	while (the) lowest																																							
149 & 160	in both varieties																																							
184	The combination D ₂ X21-d produced																																							
222	difference(s)																																							
228	subsequent																																							



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments	ethical issues:- If there is any ethical issue please clarify. Competing interest-; If there are any competing interest please clarify.	Actually I myself conducted this work for degree of Ph. D and it was critically examined. The results are clearly helpful for the growers. No competing interests exist.
---	--	---