



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	MS: 2012/AJEA/2282
Title of the Manuscript:	ASSESSMENT OF GENOTYPE X ENVIRONMENT INTERACTION AND STABILITY OF PROMISING SUGARCANE GENOTYPES FOR DIFFERENT AGRONOMIC CHARACTERS IN PESHAWAR VALLEY.

General guideline for Peer Review process is available in this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

- This form has total 9 parts. Kindly note that you should use all the parts of this review form.



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<p>Results & Discussions :</p> <p>Lines 115-118 : The authors say that some of the genotypes showed values indication stable behaviour, but the description indicated are not clearly matching with the information in Tables 4. The values/statements need to be rechecked.</p> <p>Line 117 : The terms “smaller than others” “close to 1” does not convey much. Such relative terms need to be avoided. One cannot conclude anything from such terms.</p> <p>Lines 131-133: “Relative stability”? What exactly do the authors mean by this? What are the threshold values (for slope, regression deviation etc..) for a variety to be relative stable?</p> <p>Lines 13-133: Does the statement match with the values mentioned in the Tables 4 ?</p> <p>It is clear from the study that none of the genotypes exhibited stability over the study environments. Rather that stating that a genotype is “relative stable”, it should be mentioned that no stable genotype could be identified. A negative finding can also be a result !!</p> <p>The manuscript needs major revision to be considered for publication.</p>	<p>Results and Discussion</p> <p>Major revisions have been made from lines 115 to 133. An attempt has been made to portray the stability of the genotypes with regards to regression coefficient values with reference to Finlay and Wilkinson (1963). However, any further suggestions in this regard would be welcomed.</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<p>Abstract : What exactly do the authors mean by relative stability?</p> <p>Line 67 : number of tillers and not Number of tillers</p> <p>Line 74 : table 2 : Use" Table2"</p> <p>Line 87 : table 3 : Use "Table 3"</p> <p>Table 1,2,4 : Change to "Germination %"</p> <p>Table 1&3 : Indicate level of significance instead of highly significant and Significant</p> <p>Line 89 : Change to "signifying its importance"</p> <p>Line 91: The word "persistent" does not seem to be suitable ! This may be changed.</p> <p>Throughout the manuscript: <i>et al</i> should be in italics</p> <p>Line 94 : change to "cultivar" instead of "cultivars"</p> <p>Line 99 : genotype instead of Genotype</p> <p>Line 166 : Check spelling of Nisson"" in the text and list of references.</p>	<p>Abstract has been corrected.</p> <p>Corrections made in lines 67 through 166.</p>
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	<p>The manuscript has to revised in the light of the above comments. The results & discussion should be more robust and convincing and the results have to be tallied with the values in the Tables.</p>	<p>Major portion of the results and discussion portion has been revised and added with figures to depict the regression values of the genotypes against their means. A central line has been added to the graphs to indicate grand mean.</p>