



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2014_AJEA_11158
Title of the Manuscript:	Effects of induced mutation on agronomic traits in barley (<i>Hordeum vulgare</i> L).
Type of the Article	

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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	The manuscript represents a valuable contribution to increasing barley variability and growth and yield characteristics by induced mutagenesis and testing the mutant lines in Kenya. I think that publication of the study could help increasing barley production in Kenya. The manuscript is well written using comprehensive English language and adequate statistical treatments for evaluation of the results. I have only two major comments and a few of minor comments on the manuscript (listed below).	I agree with the reviewer, owing to the fact that mutation breeding is increasingly being adopted by breeders in Kenya to solve problems
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	I have two major comments: In Table 1, I have not found the data on growth and yield parameters from the parental cultivar Nguzo - they have to be clearly indicated or promptly added to the table. In the manuscript text, I have not found references [21] and [22] listed in the reference list. They have to be either added to the manuscript text or removed from the reference list. Manufacturer of the statistical programme GENSTAT has to be specified in the manuscript (line 113). Minor comments: Formal comments - insert a space between the two sentences (line 29), between the word „peanuts“ and the following reference (line 31).	In the manuscript....line number 184 was the nguzo parental line. I have indicated it on table 1. I have made a complete overhaul on the references I have indicated I have made the changes



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Add a comma before the words „especially“ (line 32) and „respectively“ (lines 193 and 198). The number has to be written in words when it is the first word in a sentence, i.e., „Seventy-four lines...“ (not „74 lines...“) - line 94 Author’s name in a reference has to be written at the beginning of a new sentence, i.e., „Rahimi et al. [17]...“ - line 190 Insert a space between a number and corresponding unit, i.e., “0.75 m” (line 101), “110 cm” (line 179), “75 cm “ (line 180) and further. Change the title of the first part of Discussion to “The effect of mutation on agronomic traits” (line 172) Use the right form of spelling for units - i.e., “ha” (not Ha) with small “h” for hectare (line 84) Correct the pronoun form to “These results....” (not “this results”) since the subject “results” is in a plural form - line 182	I have made the changes I have made the changes have made the changes have made the changes have made the changes have made the changes have made the changes
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The manuscript could contribute to increasing barley production in Kenya. It contains original research data from field experiments with adequate statistical treatments and it is thus worth publishing after a minor revision.	This is very true..and this can be used as a model for mutation breeding