



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>American Journal of Experimental Agriculture</u>
Manuscript Number:	2013_AJEA_7031
Title of the Manuscript:	Correlation and path coefficients Analysis between Morphological Characteristics and Conservable grain Yield under conditions of different planting method of sweet corn and super sweet (Zea Mays L. var. Saccharata) varieties
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	This manuscript needs a major revision and therefore I will only point out some to facilitate this. There is also a need of English improvements as well as the typing Abstract. OK, but should be shortened Introduction: Informative, but could be more structured and less wordy. Objectives with the study should be more clearly stated Material and Methods. The first part is objectives and should be in the introduction Some of the traits must be explained, eg grain depth, grain percentage, ear cob percentage Results and Discussion In this case it is better to use a Result and a Discussion section The result is not very good presented eg other trait names is sometime used in text and tables Sometimes the data presented in text is different from that in Tables e.g. page 6 line 201 $r=0.53$	Abstract: Became brief as much as possible. Introduction: Introduction has been re-edited. as much as possible errors have been corrected. Purposes been added Material and Methods: The desired changes, revisions, and added Results and Discussion: The desired changes, revisions, and added. Results and discussions Became separated on the basis of the Journal system, was corrected References: The desired changes, revisions, and added. References were reviewed and corrected based on the Journal system.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	should be $r=0.05$ as I can understand. Table 4-6 is not well presented. There is better ways to present stepwise regressions References There are several references in the text but not in the list and vice verse Some ref. are misspelled in the text and the style is incorrect e.g. page 3 line 77 ..the results of (Amiri et al 2009 and Agrama 1996) should be Amiri et al. (2009) and Agrama (1996).	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		