



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2014_AJEA_10704
Title of the Manuscript:	Participatory on-farm evaluation of some storage methods and grain protectants on quality characteristics 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		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<p>The following corrections should be made:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Line 19 – towards the end, there should be a space between incurred and HTS. 2. All the scientific names of the insect pests and the plants should be checked because most of their generic and specific names are written as one word (not separated). They should be separated. 3. Line 47 – towards the end, in brackets, <i>S. granaries</i> was written wrongly. This should be corrected to <i>S. granarius</i>. This correction should be effected in any other place(s) where the same word appears 4. Line 65 – There should be a space between <i>xanthoxyloides</i> & and. 5. Line 66 – Another space between the first word and among. 6. Line 71 and any other place where Anon., 2008 appears in the text should be coreected to appropriate number [10] as per the guidelines. 7. Line 91 – Scope of the study should be corrected to Study Area. 8. The Discussion should be enriched with more previous findings supporting your own findings and suggestions. The ones provided are not enough. 9. Line 268 – the word ‘the” between current and 	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>postharvest should be deleted.</p> <p>10. Reference numbers on the list should be in this type of brackets - [].</p>	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The paper is educative and has contributed a lot in the area of food security.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mohammed Suleiman
Department, University & Country	Department of Biology, Umaru Musa Yar'adua University, Katsina, Nigeria