



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	<u>American Journal of Experimental Agriculture</u>
Manuscript Number:	2013_AJEA_5222
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Skip-Row Cotton Planting Pattern and Plant Density on Cotton Growth, Yield, Fiber Quality, and Net Returns
Type of the Article	Research paper

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

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

- This form has total 7 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 (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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Line 4-5 – Unclear, rephrase sentence Section 3.2 – Provide an explanation why there was no effect of seeding rate, rather than a Lit. Rev. Use lit rev. to support explanation. For example, seeding rate had no effect because plants compensate, producing increase yield per plant with fewer plants, while in higher planting density individual plant productivity decrease. Previous comment applies for section 3.3, and 3.4.	Done Explanation for no differences between seeding rate included. Not always possible to explain differences and in this study differences were minor or did not exist. Authors feel that sometimes it is best to just cite other studies to compare results.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Line 3 page 2 need an “and” following plant densities. Line 11 and 12 page 2 replace “the” with “a” Line 15 page 4, line 14 page 11, and choose 3 or 4 of the major references. Line 8 and 9 page 18	Done No, not applicable Authors feel that all citations are important and should be left.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	This is an interesting article that aim to demonstrate that solid planting pattern of cotton is more economical than skip-row pattern. However, the manuscript was not well written, with some revision, particularly in regards to explanation of the results would significantly increase the quality of the manuscript.	Comments have been added