



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEA_24292
Title of the Manuscript:	Salt-tolerant triticale (X Triticosecale Witt) cultivation in Jordan as a new forage crop
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	Comments: 1. Research paper is well written as for result and discussion is concerned. I think there is need to elaborate research methodology and include data regarding situation of salinity in Jordan. 2. First paragraph of the introduction needs to be review again. 3. Triticale yield in other countries should also be included in introduction. 4. Nutritional value of of triticale and barley should be compared other forage crop also. 5. Table should be described in the form of graph. 6. Please include some more references.	1. Methodology was disciplined also by adding extra paragraph at beginning. Data recorded salinity in Jordan were added to the introduction, Data recorded salinity in the trial sites were reported in the materials and methods. 2. The paragraph reviewed in terms of splitting, scientific names, and punctuation. 3. Triticale yield in Syria reported representing an experiment which was conducted in 2010. 4. Please, check paragraph two in the introduction. 5. Please, which table do you mean? Generally, Table of yields graphed but the table of forage quality was not graphed in the corrected manuscript. It is very easy for the reader to seed a graph for the first, but for the second it sounds not good, due to much elaborated data.



SDI Review Form 1.6

		6. Other references were added related salinity in Jordan and tritcale yield in Syria, please check the references list for more first 5 references. 7. We will recommend the editorial office to consider this paper as a short communication rather than an original research article.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		<i>Dear reviewer:</i> Thank you very much for all of your comments and advices. <i>Correspondent author</i>