



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2013_AJEA_6197
Title of the Manuscript:	Effects of variety on yield and water productivity of fadama-grown rice (<i>Oryza sativa</i> L.) in Akure, southwestern Nigeria.
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	1. The study sort to investigate the effects of variety on yield and water productivity. The empirical literature did not address these issues. Hence the discussion was deficient. The author(s) must introduce the relevant empirical literature. 2. Substantial experimentation was done. However, the report (especially the literature and discussion) did not capture the work succinctly. 3. A mix of UK and US English was used. This is unacceptable. There is the need for consistency. Line 54-56 must ne re-written. Survey should be in the past tense (line 51) Line 58: delete 'in rice' : Line 85: 'In future climates' this is not clear.	The cited lines were corrected
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Experimentation involves lots of resources. Therefore, the reporting on experiments must be appropriate in order to reflect the effort put in the experiment. The literature review and the discussion must be re-done.	Thank you