



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advances in Agricultural Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAAR_63436
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of Inbred Lines of Field Corn through Line x Tester Method
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/journal/10/editorial-policy>)

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>I suggest that the author(s) provide references in most of the areas indicated in the introduction section. The introduction section was supported with enough references/citation.</p> <p>The data collection section should be reframed to show actually what was obtained in the field especially in the area of maize grain yield measurement against observation procedure reported by the author. For example, How did you take observation on the maize grain yield instead of measuring the grain yield? Indicate the analytical tool employed in your statistical analysis in your 2.3.</p> <p>I suggest you delete the first sentence in your results section and recast the second sentence as suggested in the text.</p> <p>I suggest a modification on table 1 title as to reflect the topic and what was done in the field. Means sum of squares which are values from the ANOVA table are not necessary in the table 1, rather the mean of each treatment from the various characters is necessary.</p> <p>The idea of bringing in the term "negatively and positively significant" in 3.1 is very confusing and should be streamlined to agree with statistical information or report.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>What forms your basis of using two replications? How many plots do you have in each replication?</p>	
Optional/General comments		



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2:

	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>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Nwite, John C</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Federal College of Agriculture, Nigeria</i>