



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2014_AJEA_9783
Title of the Manuscript:	Apples (<i>Malus domestica</i>, Bork.) Phenology in Ethiopian Highlands: Plant growth, Blooming, Fruit Development and Fruit Quality Perspectives
Type of the Article	Review

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 needs thorough English revision, particularly on sentence construction, grammar and spellings e.g. in the abstract the word midium should be corrected to medium. Use of capital letters should be consistent throughout in the titles and subtitles. Also, authors should take note of words that have capital letters in the middle of sentences e.g. page 16, High Yielding, Insect, Precocious and Graft. Some sentences are too long that the reader loses the main message. Sentences should be shortened and be precise No coherence in in-text citing format as well as in the bibliography. Here the authors need to follow the standard stipulated referencing format of the journal. There is lack of consistency in the use of terminology e.g. in the abstract line 6, rootstock-scion... and in line 7, scion—... rootstock ... Figures 2 and 3 and Tables 5, 8 and 9 should be introduced in the text. Use standard abbreviation for temperature. There are variable on the 'o'	I agree
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The term 'Bork.' need to be changed to 'Borkh.' The authors need to remove commas used unnecessarily especially following 'that' and in the rest of the manuscript. Authors need NOT to use semicolon (;) and comma (,) interchangeably particularly when they mean a comma and not a semicolon. All cultivars should be represented in the same manner and normally in quotes. The authors should make sure that they use the term figure or fig. in a consistent manner. In the introduction Authors should state the meaning of the abbreviation m.a.s.l. the first time they used it. Paragraph 2, line 4. 2000 m-4500m.a.s.l should be 2000-4500 m.a.s.l. ...	I agree



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Page 3, paragraph 1 line 4, ... over. (EIAR, Progress report, 1986). Remove the full stop before the reference. The term data basis should be changed to databases and should be one word. This should be applied to all. Materials and methods Paragraph 1, lines 6-12 reads as one continuous sentence that has been given a break but not sufficient. This part needs rephrasing. Paragraph 2, line 8, (x) should be (viii) and (xi) should be (ix). Body Page 5, Paragraph 2, 'chiller units' should be just 'chill units' Page 6, paragraph 2, line 2 repetition of 'in the' and paragraph 3, in to should be one word. Page 9, paragraph 3, 'Dereje, <i>et al.</i>, (2010) ... the affiliation and place of the authors should be removed and this should be applied to all other authors whose affiliations are included in the text as part of referencing. Page 9, Paragraph 3, line 5, term 'braking' should be changed to 'breaking'. Page 12 paragraph 2, the sentence, 'The result revealed that leaves are receptor for short day...' need relooking. Tables footprint should note include the term N.B. Page 26, paragraph 1, HC on line 6 should be H_c The term 'adapted from...' is missing on table and figures adapted from other publications Page 28, paragraph 1, line 2; fig.5 should be fig. 6 The term 'phonology' on page 45 should be 'phenology'	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The paper is too long and could do better if shortened and streamlined	It's possible to summarize some topics, but the paper may lack coherency and some important informations will be missed