



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2014_AJEA_11495
Title of the Manuscript:	Sustainable Production of Groundnut (<i>Arachis hypogaea</i> L.) through Screening and Selection of Soil Salinity-Tolerant Genotypes
Type of the Article	Original Research Article



[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 manuscript shows several weak points. Apparently authors are not aware of the formal standards of scientific publication with a balance of contents of the sections of the paper. The title itself contains a taxonomic error. Authorship of this species is written L. not l. Although salt tolerance in this species was analyzed in many papers, authors cite just one reference, omitting important publications, such as the one by Singh et al. 2008, published in Australian Journal of Crops Science, where responses to salt stress were analyzed in 127 genotypes of groundnut. Therefore the section of Discussion, where authors compare their data with results published on species that have absolutely no relation to <i>Arachis</i>, is completely meaningless. Authors explain in Material and Methods meaningless details, such as the way to prepare NaCl solutions, but relevant aspects are not mentioned (such as statistic treatment of germination percentages, which normally requires	The taxonomic error has been corrected as suggested The paper referred to (Singh <i>et al.</i>, 2008) has been downloaded and used. Meanwhile, it is clear that adequate references have been used. If such details are not provided, reviewers would have as well asked questions on how such were carried out. Statistical data have been included in the results for germination



SDI Review Form 1.6

	an arcsin transformation prior ANOVA). The experimental design is unsatisfactory: germination was carried out at room temperature on a laboratory bench, and not under controlled conditions in a germination chamber as it is required in this type of studies. The initial day of germination is presented in one table, together with the percentage but an indicator of germination rate would have been more appropriate (e. g. Timpson rate of germination). After direct germination in saline solutions, a test of germination recovery would have been useful. Data on plant growth are presented in large tables, but graphs would have been more appropriate. Finally my main criticism is that the results obtained are practically not analyzed and not discussed.	Many research on germination studies have been carried out in germination chambers, but several others have placed seeds between 2 layers of filter paper (e.g Mensah 2006 cited by Singh et al., 2008). Germination studies on layers of filter papers does not in any way invalidate the results Yes, certain germination studies observe seedling recovery after germination depending on the scope of the research. If the results are presented in figures, there would have been many figures that will take more pages. Table 1 for instance would have been 3 figures. I think the data in table forms are clear and comprehensive. Yes, I agree with this comment. Statistics have been included in Table 1, which was the only table where such was missing initially. Results for germination have also been discussed (see first paragraph in Discussion section: lines 1-9 with references 9-14).
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		