

-----Original Message-----

From: XXX YYY<xxx@yyy.zzz>

Sent: Tue, Nov 25, 2014 at 6:45 PM

To: Managing Editor

Subject: Re: Request for editorial decision for manuscript number 2014_AJEA_13689

I saw the corrections made by the authors, but they still need to proceed to further ones. In the Abstract, as I have already written, there are abbreviations (DAS and CGR) which are not fully explained. An abstract should be able to stand alone as information, and every detail is needed in order to be comprehensive.

The CD is explained in the M&M as well as yield but the discussion is still poor. For example the authors state in the part of the results on yield:

"HNG 10 variety was recorded higher and almost similar pod and kernel yields under the first three sowing dates beginning from 20 April to 9 June (Table 3). Delayed sowing of this variety beyond 9 June on 4 July resulted in significant reduction in these yields. On the contrary, yield of TG 37A variety progressively increased under later dates of sowing with the highest yields recorded under the last sowing date of 4 July. Since this is a short duration variety of determinate growth habit, it recorded the highest yields in the last date of sowing as this sowing date provided optimum maturity period requirement to this variety. The early sowing dates provided very longer than optimum periods and harsh environments to this variety of determinate growth habit, these dates recorded significantly lower yields. Since the pod and kernel yields are cumulative function of the yield attributes, the variation in pod and kernel yields of these varieties as affected by sowing dates. These results are also in close agreement with the findings of [3, 7]."

So HNG variety responded better during early sowing while TG37A during late sowing. So the references at the end {3,7} agree with what data? Those of HNG or TG37A? I believe the authors should incorporate some references within the text and not only at the end of each paragraph. Furthermore, it should be nice to see in which points the data in this paper agree with that of others, because reference 7 seems to present data on the effect of flowering period and not of sowing date. So the discussion should be more detailed and comprehensive, than just referring to whether the data presented agree or not with those from the literature. All the comments and assumptions made by the authors from the beginning of the paragraph to the end of it could be justified by the presence of a suitable literature. By this way the discussion could be vastly improved.

Editor's Details:

Peter A. Roussos

Lab. Pomology, Agricultural University of Athens, Greece

Note: Modification was done in this document ONLY to hide the email id.