



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

|                          |                                                                                                                      |
|--------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Journal Name:            | <a href="#">American Journal of Experimental Agriculture</a>                                                         |
| 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 |

PART 2:

| FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 | Authors' response to final evaluator's comments                                                                                                                                                                                                                |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p>The quality of the paper has improved very much. The authors have done a very good and prompt work.</p> <p>The following minor corrections are still suggested:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Abstract: Please present a clear conclusion for the paper as recommended by the journal (e.g. <b>CONCLUSION:</b> The study suggests the use solid planting pattern over skip-row pattern along the upper Texas Gulf Coast of the US).</li> <li>Line 163-164: Typographical correction “compensation” ..... “authors”.</li> <li>Line 209: In 2003...</li> <li>Tables 3, 4 and 5: Use superscript lowercase letters in the tables (e.g. under “days to cutout” use 106.3<sup>a</sup> instead of 106.3a. Additionally, please provide a footnote to explain the referenced “b” values e.g. in table 3 under “lint yield” the value 1347<sup>b</sup> should have a footnote <sup>b</sup>Explanation to qualify the value 1347).</li> </ol> | <p><b>The last sentence in abstract does state such</b></p> <p><b>Done</b></p> <p><b>Done</b></p> <p><b>The reviewer must be looking at the data differently since the ‘a’ or ‘b’ is used to denote significant differences as stated in footnote ‘a’.</b></p> |