



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2015_AJEA_16669
Title of the Manuscript:	A Rapid Morphological Screening Procedure for Pea Under Drought Stress in Greenhouse Settings
Type of the Article	Short 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 <i>(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)</i>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Line 16 Line 57 Lines 71, 72, 100, 106, 116 Line 77 and 87	“Requirement” instead of “acquirement”? Please specify the number of days until flowering, especially since it is commented that the “Banner” variety is five to six days earlier than “Aragorn”, and how this influenced the watering regime. Insert “(results not shown)” at these various mentioning of results, since these are not indicated in any graph or table. It is highly recommended that the quantitative data are all presented in a table, with statistics included. Consistent use of Fig. or Figure throughout	Acquirement was changed to requirement All Fig. Were changed to Figure
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	It would have been preferable if the authors included a measure of water status of the plants themselves, and not just growth statistics. For example leaf water content or relative water content. From this the mechanism of drought tolerance or avoidance could be deduced. The growth characteristics of the two varieties may be responsible for the difference in their drought response, especially if they are very diverse.	Leaf water content and relative water content was not sampled. We agree that this was not ideal, but we will include it in the suggestions for the next experiment. This is true but we have shown that our drought stress treatments impact the overall growth regardless the differences observed in each variety.