Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJARR_54077**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Line X Tester Analysis for Protein content in Quality Protein Maize (QPM) (Zea mays L.) Genotypes**
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)

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.** The article is worthy publishing but the author (s) need attention on the M&M section which is basis of the study, otherwise, if this section is not clear that is a miss. **2.** The soil parameters analysis need to be clear here and brief on the methods and I have not seen them in the discussion nor any Table. **3.** Some statements needs reference and some are too long which need splitting **4.** Sometime in the article the author tend to report as "treatment" What are these treatments can we name instead of hiding. **5.** Some reference are missing in text and in the reference section and it is indicated in the document **6.** Statistics section is where you explain on how the data was handled and if it was transformed not methods used for protein determination etc…….. **7.** Was this (results in the table) subjective to ANOVA and any information on significance and it applies to the other tables to follow **8.** In the conclusion section 'No need to qualify the results but report your conclusion remarks' **9.** Some statements are supposed to be in the R&D **10.** There are some insertion in the document which needs author (s) to scrutinize **11.** Make the R&D strong	The article has been thoroughly modified and revised
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

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)*	