SCIENCEDOMAIN *international*
www.sciencedomain.org

SCIENCEDOMAIN

SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
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**
Type of the Article	**Research paper**

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 7 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	**The paper "Effect of Skip-Row Cotton Planting Pattern and Plant Density on Cotton Growth, Yield, Fiber Quality, and Net Returns" is a study based on an economically-relevant plant. The study does not show any solid improvement with the skip-row method . The solid plantings have a greater net returns and higher yield. The paper might have some intrinsic value in the applied field. However, I believe that:** **1) It would add value to the paper if data concerning the cellulose content/distribution were provided. Since cellulose is one of the key components of cell wall, I would suggest to try to get a quantification in the planting systems tested. This would better support the data presented (especially when the fiber quality is described). Ideally the content of cellulose should be measured by fractionating the cell wall polysaccharides, but I realize that the procedure is often laborious. However simple microscopic observations and straight-forward staining methods could be used (calcofluor white staining for instance) to have an idea of the distribution.** **2) I could not find details in Mat and Methods concerning how the uniformity and fiber strength parameters were calculated and**	

	more in general how fiber quality assessment was performed. The authors can specify better.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	It would be interesting to correlate the results of this paper to fibre crops (like *Cannabis sativa* for example). Hemp grown at high density generally shows higher number of bast fibers and decreased amount of lignin-rich core. Although bast and cotton fibers have different origins, it would be interesting to comment on cotton and crop fibers planting systems (the effects of high density on the quality and the economic aspect) in the last paragraph.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Gea Guerriero**
Department, University & Country	**Centre de Recherche Public – Gabriel Lippmann, Luxembourg**