



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

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	I wonder that the final decision of salt tolerant genotype was made without check (salt tolerance) and negative check (salt sensitive). Also, the cluster analysis would be applied to validate the best genotype with high yield trait. In this form of MS, I do not recommend for publication.	I do not agree with the conclusion made by the reviewer. No specific things were pointed out that are wrong to be corrected. Reviewers are supposed to do critical analysis of each section, make suggestions on how to improve the quality of the paper, and bring out the specific things that will justify the rejection of such a manuscript. Other reviewers pointed out specific things to be added or removed that have really improved the quality of the manuscript, while the position of this reviewer differed from 4 others. This reviewer has not been able to justify why the manuscript should not be published. Based on the comment of the reviewer, I assume that only the concluding part of the manuscript was read without doing justice to the content
Minor REVISION comments		



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments		
---	--	--