



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEA_21477
Title of the Manuscript:	Photosynthetic Efficiency and Antioxidant Activity of Cotton under Drought Stress during Early Floral Bud Development
Type of the Article	Original 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 manuscript represents a useful study on photosynthesis (stomatal conductance, chlorophyll fluorescence characteristics, photosynthesis pigments contents) and ROS-scavenging- related characteristics (APX, CAT, SOD activities) in cotton leaves under control and drought conditions (two weeks of water withholding). The experimental data are presented clearly including relevant statistical evaluation. I have only a few minor formal comments on the data presentation. When expressing the alpha level of statistical significance, write "$P = 0.05$" with zero before the point. Minor formal comments: Line 351: Insert "a" before the words "significant increase", i.e., "a significant increase in activity..." Conclusion, line 379: The sentence has to be rephrased as follows: "The knowledge of cultivars with enhanced drought stress tolerance helps producers to select the most appropriate cultivar for their location."	Dear Reviewer, Thank you very much for your comments. They are much appreciated. Regarding the expression of P values, we agree with your comments. However, we initially expressed the P values without the zero before the decimal point in order to agree with the journal general guidelines for publication, as followed: <u>Guideline for Reporting P values:</u> P is always italicized and capitalized. i) Correct expression: ($P = .05$). Wrong Expression: ($P < .05$), unless $P < .001$. ii) The P value should be expressed to 2 digits whether or not it is significant. If $P < .01$, it should be expressed to 3 digits. iii) When rounding, 3 digits is acceptable if rounding would change the significance of a value (eg, $P = .049$ rounded to .05). iv) Expressing P to more than 3 significant digits does not add useful information since precise P values with extreme results are sensitive to biases or departures from the statistical model. v) Reporting actual P values avoids this problem



SDI Review Form 1.6

		of interpretation. <i>P</i> values should not be listed as not significant (NS) since, for meta-analysis, the actual values are important and not providing exact <i>P</i> values is a form of incomplete reporting. vi) Do not use 0 before the decimal point for statistical values <i>P</i>, alpha, and beta because they cannot equal 1. Line 351: Change was made to adjust the sentence. Line 379 on conclusion section: Change was made to adjust the sentence.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		