



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 (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 paper is of scientific interest, and the topic falls within the scope of the journal. However, there are revisions to be done. These include: 1. The results are not comprehensively presented. The results (in table or graphic form) for the following parameters are missing in the manuscript. a. Root length b. Root dry weight c. Number of pods per plant d. Number of viable seeds per pod e. Pod length f. Pod width 2. More explicitly comprehensive discussion is needed for the results in relation to other related studies.	1. These have been added, please see Table 1. 2. This was addressed.
Minor REVISION comments	Title 3. Include the scientific name of the plant in the title Abstract 4. Material and methods: There is a need to mention the names of the two pea cultivars 5. Results: Include absolute values of the parameters studied. E.g. Root length, root dry weight, pod length, etc. significantly ($P < 0.001$) differed between cultivars. Banner produced higher values of root length (x cm), root dry weight (x g), pod length (x cm) etc. than root length (x cm), root dry weight (x g), pod length (x cm) etc. of Aragorn respectively.	3. This was added. 4. The names of the cultivars appear in the first sentence of the Materials and Methods section. 5. Absolute values with standard error were added on Table 1. 6. This was done. 7. Repeated words are crucial to both the title and a search. We feel the words should remain



SDI Review Form 1.6

	6. Conclusion: You need to re-write the conclusion. The conclusion should be a summary statement of the results and its application/recommendation. 7. Key words: Do not repeat words of the title Results and Discussion 8. Refer to the compulsory revision comments above 9. Scientifically it is recommended to present bar charts with error bars. Therefore, you need to include error bars in Figures 1 and 2. 10. When comparing two subjects, use between. If more than two subjects the right word is among – Check and comply 11. The style for reporting P value (Refer to Authors Guidelines): The following sentence's should read: (a) Line 75. "A statistically significant ($P < 0.001$) differences in shoot height was observed between varieties and among treatments." (b) Line 85. "Shoot dry weight was also impacted by drought, being significantly ($P < 0.001$) different among treatments and between varieties." (c) Line 100. Confirm from the analysis the value of P among the treatments. If $P = 0.1$ then the sentence should read "Root length did not significantly ($P > 0.05$) differ among treatments and between varieties." However, if $P = 0.01$, then the sentence should read "Root length differed ($P < 0.05$) significantly among treatments, however, there were no significant ($P > 0.05$) differences between varieties." (d) Line 103-104. Similarly, confirm from the analysis the value of P between varieties. If $P = 0.3$ then the sentence should read "Root dry weight did not differ ($P > 0.05$) significantly among treatments and between varieties."	unchanged. 8. Reference was made. 9. The style of graphic utilized was changed. This negated the need for the use of error bars; while error was added to absolute values. 10. This was changed. 11. a, b, c, d, e were all implemented. Thank you.
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	However, if $P=0.03$ the sentence should read "Root dry weight differed ($P<0.05$) significantly between varieties, however, there were no significant ($P>0.05$) differences among treatments." (e) Line 106-107. "The number of pods per plant were highly significantly ($P<0.001$) different among treatments and also showed a significant ($P<0.05$) differences between varieties.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		