



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2014_AJEA_14979
Title of the Manuscript:	Spinach yield is increased by larger plug cell volume and an exogenous BAP spray
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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	1) I agree that growth and developmental parameters lead to yield but yield data were not collected in this study; so the title of this work need to be changed since growth and developmental parameters were measured not yield 2) The aim of the study is not clear; it should be re-written. 3) Line 10, it should be we analyzed (past tense not present tense) 4) From line 22 to line 33, I am suspecting the references 1, 2, 3, 5 cited are the authors of this manuscript. If such is not the case these lines need a re-touch. 5) Line 42, it should be seedling not seeding. 6) From line 42 to line 44, the objective is not reflecting the work carried out by the authors. The authors measured growth and developmental parameters but not the yield. This objective need to be re-written. 7) Line 101, it should be data were What type of statistical software did you use to analyze your data? 8) Line 129, what does the table stand for? The table is not completed because no value is presented but only significance. And why did you give the same title to both the table and figure 1?	1) Title has been changed. 2) The aim was precisely defined. 3) Line 10 has been changed. 4) Yes, we published references 1, 2, 3 and 5. 5) Line 42. It is correct. 6) OK, suggested changes were made. 7) Software information has been added. 8) The ANOVA table from line 129 is associated to Figure 1, such as the rest of the ANOVA significances.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The manuscript is well-structured and with good English.	