



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2014_AJEA_15206
Title of the Manuscript:	The Influence of Shade and Organic Fertiliser Treatments on the Physiology and Establishment of Cacao (<i>TheobromaCacao</i>) Clones
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	Title: Utilise scientific names and separate genus from species name. Abstract: Should be sentence case and bold, revise aim not clear "plant nutrition" Study design-How many seasons, line 12. Remove sited, separate 1.6 from ha, mention the four genotypes, shades and fertilizer levels in brackets (), Methodology: Line 16: separate scientific names, 140 from kg, line 19, 1, 800 kg/ha and NOT 1, 800kg/ha, be specific with "microclimate", leaf traits??? Results: No results on soil nutrients, leaf traits, Line42: separate challenging from particularly, Line 44, 47 citation (5-7) change to (5, 7), Use of pertinent in line 49; line 53: separate aim from of, Line 54: plantresponse, line 55: fertilizer from under Bold materials and methods line 56, Line 57: Experimental site and NOT Site, Section: Microclimate-where was Stevenson's screen placed??? Results Line 153 – 155 not clear about light, medium, heavy percent attainments!! Line 134, use MS equation Table 4 indicate statistics Line 327 revise	Title: Scientific names utilised. Genus and species names separated. Abstract: In sentence case now (although I noticed that SDI paper Template stipulates 'CAPS'). Made bold now. <u>Aim</u> revised. <u>Study design</u> "Sited" removed. Also, "1.6" separated from "ha". Similar correction effected throughout manuscript. (I have noticed, however, that some of the wrongly combined words would not allow correction. They automatically go back to that wrong state even after being corrected. I would appreciate your assistance in that regard). The four genotypes, shades and fertilizer levels now mentioned in brackets. Introduction: Lines 47 and 50 - Whereas citation (5, 7) would refer to 5 and 7, citation (5-7) refers to 5, 6 and 7 and this is what we meant here. I can, however, make the suggested change if needed still. Methodology: Specific "microclimate" and "leaf trait" measurements indicated. Lines 115 & 139, MS equations used now. Results: Results on <i>soil nutrients</i> may be found in Table 2 (the 2 rows labelled: "Experimental site"). Results on <i>Leaf traits</i> may be found under section 3.7, summarised in Table 4.



SDI Review Form 1.6

		Line 157 -159: The 'medium' shade regime, for example, attained between 52% and 57% shade. Within that regime, the lower shade levels (i.e. towards 52%) were obtained in the dry season. This is because in that season, the shade plants experienced a reduction in the leaf area index due to accelerated senescence and leaf shedding. Therefore, shade levels were lower in the dry season and higher in the rainy seasons. Table 4 Statistics now indicated
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Do thorough editing and formatting of the document once more	Editing and better formatting done.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		