



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 (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)
Compulsory 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 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>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p>	<p>Abstract : What exactly do the authors mean by relative stability? Line 67 : number of tillers and not Number of tillers Line 74 : table 2 : Use" Table2" Line 87 : table 3 : Use "Table 3" Table 1,2,4 : Change to "Germination %" Table 1&3 : Indicate level of significance instead of highly significant and Significant Line 89 : Change to "signifying its importance" Line 91: The word "persistent" does not seem to be suitable ! This may be changed. Throughout the manuscript: <i>et al</i> should be in italics Line 94 : change to "cultivar" instead of "cultivars" Line 99 : genotype instead of Genotype Line 166 : Check spelling of Nisson"" in the text and list of references.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<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>	

Note: Anonymous Reviewer