



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

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

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
I am pleased to see that most of the recommendations were followed. The purpose of the paper is now much clearer. However there are still some corrections to be done. I insist that the paper would be more informative if these corrections are done. - There was misunderstanding on my previous comments number 4, 5 and 6. If you carefully observe on the comments, I was referring to Material and Methods, Results, and Conclusion for the "ABSTRACT" - So for the abstract refer to the track changes provided and include standard errors for the mean values. - The original main conclusion in section 4 was excellently written. You only needed to interchange and modify the last two sentences. Refer to the track changes provided. - Key words: I still insist that there is no need to repeat words of the title. Keywords are supposed to be the subjects/elements of the study. Refer to the track changes. - The titles of tables 1 and 2 should be written at the top of the tables. Except the last part/statement for table 2. This should be written as a note. - Include standard errors for the mean values in Table 2 - Figures 1 and 2. Bar charts are appropriate for this type of data. Line graphs are used to compare changes over same period of time, while Bar Charts are used to compare things between different groups. Refer to the bar charts provided on the track changes.	- This was changed, thank you. - Thank you, we reverted to our original conclusion. The main objective of this paper was not to identify potential parent material for future breeding, but was to introduce a new rapid morphological screening procedure to test cultivars in a greenhouse setting. While Banner was superior to Aragorn in this comparison, we do not mean to suggest that Banner should be widely adopted as parent material based on this one observation, we leave the decision of effective parent material selection up to the breeders. We maintained your suggestion for the abstract's conclusion, but reverted to our original conclusion for the main paper body. Nearly all tracked changes were accepted, thank you. - We vehemently disagree. We thank you for your suggested search terms but feel that their use would dramatically decrease the "searchability" of this paper. We stand firm on our commitment to the original search terms and are bolstered by the fact that not a single other reviewer commented on the search terms or suggested changing them. - These changes were made, thank you. - This was done, thank you. - Figures 1 and 2 were altered and recreated. Thank you.