



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#"><u>International Journal of Plant &amp; Soil Science</u></a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJPSS_23570</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Grain protein, oil and starch contents and yields of maize (Zea mays L.) as affected by deficit irrigation, genotype and their interaction</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Articles</b>

**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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>The work is interesting and very extensive.</p> <p>It should be determined the limit of pages.</p> <p>Of the many results could be even two articles.</p> <p>The article, which has 31 pages It becomes opaque and uninteresting.</p>	<p>I agree with you. But, as a plant breeder, I want to emphasize on the genotypic variation in the studied germplasm to identify the appropriate ones for use in future use in maize breeding programs. That is why I described the role of genotypes, and their interaction with irrigation regimes as well as grouping of genotypes on different bases.</p> <p>I agree with you that the article is interesting as you said in the beginning.</p>
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p>In the Materials and Methods are given the experimental years 2012, 2013 and 2014. However, in the results are evaluations for the years 2013, 2014.</p> <p>In the discussion and conclusion is not enough to note results.</p> <p>It is necessary to explain why the variants (WS) are higher in protein and starch content and why lower in oil content (%).</p> <p>What kind of genotype represents a variant checks – control on Fig 1?</p>	<p>Yes, making F<sub>1</sub> diallal crosses was done in 2012 year, while evaluation was done in 2013 and 2014 years. Please refer to Materials and Methods.</p> <p>I think it is enough. Otherwise, the manuscript will be too long</p> <p>I corrected the explanation in page 8 as follows:</p> <p>"It seems that under drought stress conditions, plants instead of using available energy for producing oil in their grains, they use it for producing starch and/or protein, which might consume less energy for their metabolism".</p> <p>I added to the title of Fig. 1 the kind of checks : <b>Checks= The single crosses SC130 and SC2055.</b> These crosses are commercial cultivars in</p>



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

	<p>In tab. 3 have to be written indication of evidential differences between genotypes.</p> <p>Table 4: Evidential differences can not be determined from the values Change%., but from the values of genotypes in the variants WW and WS.</p>	<p>EGYPT.</p> <p>In Table 3 : I added genotypes (G) to LSD and explained G in the title of the table. Please see the correction in the manuscript.</p> <p>The values of LSD for irrigations (I) are shown in table 4. In the title of the table G and I meanings are added.</p>
<b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments	I recommend manuscript significantly reduce.	When the small paragraphs are merged, the manuscript will be reduced.