



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_45162
Title of the Manuscript:	Combining Ability and Gene Actions in Maize for Grain Yield and other Selected Agronomic Traits under Contrasting Nitrogen Conditions
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/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

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		
Minor REVISION comments	Title: include-----in Ibadan, Nigeria Abstract: State the significance of this study Introduction: Paragraphs are too long, shorten them. 2.0 Material and methods 2.1 Experimental site: State latitude and longitude coordinates, soil type and inherent NPK levels 2.2 Crop management: State when the crop was planted and weeding done 2 rows- Do these represent the N levels? 3.0 Results: Page 5 paragraph 2, 2nd sentence-----while the range from optimal N was from 2320.58 to ----- Recommendations are missing	I feel addition of Ibadan, Nigeria in the title will make the title too long. The significance is stated in the background information in the abstract. Some words are now added to make the significance clearer. Shortening the paragraphs more than this may fragment the write up and result in loss of some vital information. The coordinates were stated in the write up. The soil was depleted of it native N by before the commencement of the trial (2.1 line 5). More information has been provided. It was stated the trial was conducted in 2014 and 2015. Section 2.2 talked about the crop management. Lines 9 and 10 stated cultural practices were done according to a recommendation (IAR&T 2010). No. 2 rows mean component of a plot. The correction has been made. The recommendations are highlighted. Additional information has also been provided as recommendation.
Optional/General comments	Well written paper and should be published after the corrections	

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	My regards to the reviewer for a keen look and thorough review.