



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	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	I like the long-term nature of the study but, unfortunately, the treatment design of the study weakens the strength of the main conclusion, inferences and policy implications. The onions were subjected to 9 treatments. The treatment combination consisted of two factors, namely onion size and watering regimes. My main concern is about the onion sizes. The authors have indicated that the sizes were grouped into three: large (44.3g); medium (26.2g); and small (16.7g). My many worry is that if someone uses 35.4g or 20.1g onions sizes, for example, which group can it belong? It could have been better if the onion sizes groups had a range i.e. less than 16.7g small; between 16.7g to 44.3g medium; and greater than 44.3g large (Refer to Missanjo et al. 2013 http://dx.doi.org/10.1155/2013/969026). Another concern is that from their presentation, it shows that they used one onion per treatment. Since the treatments were replicated three times, it means they used 27 onions, unless otherwise. This makes the sample size to be too small, hence this also weakens the main conclusion, inferences and policy implication. Consequently, it is recommended that the study be presented as an applied-	The study was conducted in year 2012 and repeated in the same period and manner in year 2013. Means of data collected for the two years were computed prior to entering them into the spread sheet for statistical analysis of variance. This has been clarified now in the revised version of the paper. In fact, four bulbs per each weight group were planted. The planted bulbs were subjected to three levels of watering regimes after emergence (see text for details). The design has been re-written to make it more explanatory. Please read section 2.2 for more details now. The section on design has now been clearly stated in the revised version of the manuscript in accordance with the reviewer's query. Though bulb sizes were not in ranges of say 20-30g, 30-40g, the means of the various sizes used were computed as shown in the tables to give an idea of the main effects, though the interaction effects were of more importance both in the presentation of the results and the discussion. Whilst we believe that it is already late to go back and change the bulb sizes or the treatment structure, we also know that this is not the first time in publishing that treatment structures are used this way. The suggestion of the reviewer is, however, very useful and will be incorporated in our future researches/studies. In fact, our conclusion was that large (44.3g) bulb size was suitable for the cultivar used in that locality. Perhaps in



SDI Review Form 1.6

	type demonstration project from which further research should follow.	our future studies ranges of bulb sizes will be used and other findings will be made in line with this observation.
Minor REVISION comments	Design and layout of experiment The authors should further outline the treatments used in the study, for simplicity sake, i.e. T1: large onions watered throughout; T2 large onions watered five weeks; T3 large onions watered three weeks;; T9 small onions watered three weeks. RESULTS Figures 1a, b and c should be combined as one with legends as T1, T2, T3, ..., T9. It is easier to compare the trend of the graphs if they are all combined. Similarly, Figures 2a, b, c and Figures 3a, b, c should be combined as one respectively. Editorial correction: • Replace ($p < 0.05$) or ($p > 0.05$) with ($P < 0.05$) or ($P > 0.05$) respectively where ever necessary. • ($P < 0.05$) or ($P > 0.05$) should be written soon after the word significantly wherever necessary.	The idea of the study was to see the effects of the two factors on the performance of the onion cultivar used. Thus in the text/article, both the main effects and the interaction were explained, though more emphasis was made on the interaction in the data presentation and the discussion. Thus in the tables and even in the Figs, one can easily see the single effects of any of the two factors or their interaction on the performance of onion. Using treatments such as T1: large onions watered throughout; T2 large onions watered five weeks; T3 large onions watered three weeks;; T9 small onions watered three weeks will be good, but in this case one will be tempted to think the experiment involved only a single factor. In factorial experiments, the importance of the interaction effect cannot be overemphasized. The authors still believe that results should be presented in the way as presented for easy comparison of the factors used in terms of their interaction. On this basis, the authors do not see why the two figures the reviewer mentioned here should be combined and the authors believe that the results of the study can thus be published in the way stated. The suggestion that ($p < 0.05$) or ($p > 0.05$) be replaced with ($P < 0.05$) or ($P > 0.05$) respectively where ever necessary and ($P < 0.05$) or ($P > 0.05$) should be written soon after the word significantly wherever necessary is very welcome and important. We are most grateful to the reviewer and these changes have been made in the revised version. Thank you.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		