



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>Journal of Experimental Agriculture International</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_33959
Title of the Manuscript:	Roots Partially Drive Super Sweet MaizeYield
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	1. Title is not reflected the content of the manuscript 2. Misspelling all over the manuscript. 3. Method: when transplanted plants versus to seedling plants were treated are unknown. Author should provide date after transplant or day from germination for seedling as reference, are they in the same growth stages? 4. Author mention that 2 concentration of BAP were used but it should be more accurate to provide the volume used as well. 5. During the treatment period, did the plants receive any water? How is the condition of the growth chamber?	1. The main result of this manuscript is that yield is partially associated to root dry weight. 2. We found and corrected misspelling. 3. Both direct-seeded and transplants were at the same growth state at the beginning of the experiment (information added to materials and methods). 4. Plants were run-off sprayed (information added to materials and methods). 5. Transplants and Experiment 1 was carried out in a greenhouse and Experiment 2 was conducted at field.
Minor REVISION comments	1. A lot of result with poor explanations. The manuscript contents a lot of useful information that should be explained in detail fashion. 2. The summary for the table or important value should be highlighted.	1. All results have been described and those which have a direct relationship with the hypothesis tested have been discussed. We would very much appreciate if reviewer can be more specific. 2. Tables and Figures summary were highlighted.
Optional/General comments		