

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Journal Name:	Annual Research & Review in Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARRB_105283
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECT OF PLANTING DATE ON ACCUMULATED GROWING DEGREE UNITS, GRAIN YIELD AND THREE GROWTH TRAITS OF 16 EGYPTIAN YELLOW MAIZE INBRED LINES
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:

(<https://www.journalarrb.com/index.php/ARRB/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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Yes, it provides some insights to optimize maize production and mitigate the impact of climate change not only for the scientific community but also for technology end users as a whole.</p> <p>Suggestion on the title "The Impact of Planting Date on Growing Degree Units, Grain Yield, and Growth Traits of Egyptian Yellow Maize Inbred Lines"</p> <p>The abstract is comprising the required information but it needs the rearrangement of sentences</p> <p>No, re-ordered (Objective, methodology, result, the way forward in brief and concise)</p> <p>Yes, scientifically correct except for some minor technical modification as indicated in word doc</p> <p>The references are not sufficient, shallow evidence, even old reference were used and should be updated</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>It is okay, - In abstract part, it needs refinement, rearrangement</p> <p>- In Introduction – some statistical evidences were lacked</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Updated references for strong justification</p> <p>Rearrangement according to components and subcomponent contents in each main body (Abstract, Introduction, Materials and Methods, Result and Discussion, Conclusion)</p> <p>Conclusion part also needs, refinement according to the obtained result</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Zelalem Tafa Tola
Department, University & Country	Ethiopian Institute of Agricultural Research, Ethiopia