



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2013_AJEA_6086
Title of the Manuscript:	Character Association and Selection Indices in Sugarcane
Type of the Article	Research Paper

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 <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	Line 8: remove “even”	Revised as suggested
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Line 10 replace “this issue” with “increase yield”	-do-
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Line 11 remove “for selection of genotypes”	-do-
	Line 14-15 remove “during the period”	-do-
	Line 17 about 60 “what?” give the units??	--
	Line 25 yield of what “sugarcane or sugar or biomass” , be specific	Revised as suggested
	Line 27 replace “these” with “other”	-do-



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Line 36 “replace” technique with method	-do-
	Line 77 Is it the number of buds was standardised at 150 per plot??	-yes-
	Line 84 and 85 replace “for” with “to”	Revised as suggested
	Line 88 these are sugarcane stalk characters	--
	Line 130-131 must be independent and dependent variables	Revised as suggested
	Line 162 replace canes with stalks throughout paper	-do-
	Line 189 replace either with “one”	-do-



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Lines 185-192 confusing. You remove one of two variables that are correlated to address multicollinearity not both as is being suggested in the paragraph. Please correct and make clear.	-do-
	Line 244-249 what are the units for genetic advance values??	The formula we used is $\Delta G = \left(\frac{z}{v}\right) * \frac{w}{\sqrt{t_p}}$ It has a ratio of w and phenotypic standard deviations. So here the genetic advance is expressed in standard units instead of that of the original data (Kindly refer to M&M section).
	Line 262 replace ">" with words	Revised as suggested
	<u>Overall comments</u>	
	The major weakness of the paper is in the results and discussion section. This section largely presents the results with very little or no discussion. The authors need to address this weakness. The discussion should highlight the meaning of the results presented as well as put that meaning in context of previous research done on selection indices on sugarcane and other crops. Very little attempt has been done in the manuscript.	Phenotypic/genotypic correlations, and multicollinearity have been explained in M&M as well as in results. Multicollinearity statistics is actually more important in removing unique variables prior to path analysis. The selection index was constructed of the variables which had a high direct effect



SDI Review Form 1.6

	For example the meaning of the phenotypic and genotypic character association need to be explained. The importance of doing multicollinearity tests as well as the meaning of the test results need to be explained to improve understanding of the readers. At the same time, the application of these results need to be explained especially how the correction of the multicollinearity helped improve the selection indices.	shown through Path analysis. References have been added to results and discussion section.
--	--	--