



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 <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	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-type demonstration project from which further research should follow.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Design and layout of experiment The authors should further outline the treatments used in the study, for	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	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.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Note: Anonymous Reviewer