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** *(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	**- The paper presents very important data for sugarcane production and application, however some modifications could be important to make the paper more robust for publication. The authors have a great quantity of results, but for example in lines 162-182 they present a lot of information but don't discuss it. It could be very rich for the work if they explain better what that results means and for example explain the meaning of negative and positive effect.** **- Another important information that could be explained during the text is the reference values of "r", this information is only in table 1 footnotes.** **- It would be very interesting to explore about the factors that were significant (growth2, Pol and tiller2). Explore about their influence, how they can influence the sugarcane yield and their importance.** **-At least, there are some references that appear on reference list but do not appear during the text.** **1 - Abdelmahmoud et al 2010** **5 - Bakshi 1997a** **17 - SAS Institute 2003** **19 - Felipe 2012**	
Minor REVISION comments	- The introduction is a little bit longer, it could be more succinct , for example, lines 40 till 64 maybe fits better in discussion. - On line 72, it says that the experiments were carried out on 2011-2013, however on line 75 it says that it was iniciated in 2010. It is a little confuse, maybe it is good to explain it better. - Line 78 gives us fertilizers rates, where did it come from? Do you have a reference for that? I think it is interesting to say it. - For language purposes, maybe it is better to change weed for grass on line 85. - On line 92 it is said that the first growth was considered in July, however it could be better to specify the plantation time.	

SDI Review Form 1.6

Optional/General comments		

Note: Anonymous Reviewer