SCIENCEDOMAIN international



www.sciencedomain.org

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.

SCIENCEDOMAIN international

www.sciencedomain.org



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2: Review Comments

	Editor's comment	Author's comment
Compulsory REVISION comments	Keywords: "G xE interaction" has no sense for readers, delete it	Keyword GXE in line 6 deleted.
	Table 1: Define "Reps" in the table legend. I do not know what "millable canes" and "number of tillers" are. They has not been defined before	Reps in table 1 changed to replications. Millable canes and No. of tillers have already been referred to on line 61.
Minor REVISION comments	Line 17: abbreviations G and E must be defined here Line 20: delete "much" Line 21: put "highlighting" instead of "signifying" Line 31: delete "to" Lines 35-36: I do not understand the whole phrase Line 49: "breeders are in search of (delete "hunting") Line 56: put "done" instead of "grown" Line 68: define "cv" Line 115: put "had" instead of "were having"	Line 17: G X E was defined. Line 20: deleted "much" Line 21: signifying replaced with highlighting Line 31: deleted "to" Line 35-36: the phrase explained further. Means stable varieties. Line 49: Words changed. Line 56: "grown" replaced with "done" Line 68: CV defined. Line 115: "were having" replaced by "had"
Optional/General comments	I am not sure if the authors have extend the discussion section in order to be more robust, according to the other referee (M. Swapna)	Attempt has been made to make the results and discussion section more elaborate and robust in the light of reviewer's comments. Each character's been discussed separately and later concluded in a concise manner. However, any advice on further improvement will of course be followed.