



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	2013_BJAST_8459
Title of the Manuscript:	INFLUENCE OF BULB SIZE AT PLANTING AND DROUGHT STRESS ON GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT OF ONION (<i>Allium cepa</i> L) IN THE NORTHERN REGION OF GHANA
Type of the 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	Generally, the paper does not bring any new information; however, the presented data might be useful for onion growers in Ghana. The main drawback is that no parameter concerning plant and soil water status was measured. Existence of water stress was declared based on plant vigour observed by eye, which is obscure. Together with small number of repetitions (n = 3) some rather surprising results are presented. For example, "the highest bulb fresh weight was obtained when plants of the large bulb were subjected to water stress..."	We are surprised by the comments raised by this reviewer that. While all the other reviewers believed the results are interesting but certain aspects of the work need more clarification, this particular reviewer claims that the results of the study do not bring any new information. In any way, if the paper does not bring any new information, why and how could he/she say again that the presented data might be useful for onion growers in Ghana? The reviewer mentioned that no data was taken on plant and soil water status. Yes we think this is a very useful comment. Equipment breakdown during the time of data collection is solely responsible for this but we still believe that climatic data and data on plant house conditions taken which has been included now will serve to give an idea about the rate of evapotranspiration in the experimental area and thus also give an idea about variations in plant and soil moisture. In actual fact, data on soil moisture content were not collected but data on weather parameters – min and max temp. And RH provided will give an indication of the rate of evapotranspiration in the plant house and thus suggest variation/trend in soil moisture. We have also incorporated data on climatic conditions (Table 2) prevailing in the whole area. The reviewer also stated that water stress was declared based on plant vigour observed by the eye, which he/she claims to be obscure. Actually, we do not know what this reviewer imply by this statement. In general, plants were scored using a defined scale of measurement and vigor score data were transformed prior to statistical analysis. This is not the first time that a score data has been used to determine plants response to biotic or



SDI Review Form 1.6

		abiotic stresses. In science data on scores should be transformed to conform to the assumptions of ANOVA prior to analysis and this is what we exactly did. The analysis of variance data on vigour has been incorporated (See Tables 3) to explain further the vigour scores in this revised version of the paper. This reviewer also queried about the small number of repetitions ($n = 3$). In fact, it has been clarified and incorporated in this revised version of the paper that four bulbs per each weight group were planted instead of one bulb and the treatment combinations were replicated three times. In fact planting 4 bulbs per weight group and replicating 3x is not a small number. This has now been clearly stated in the revised version of the manuscript in accordance with the reviewer's query. Thank you.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		