



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	The paper propose that a new crop suitable for small holders that suffering from soil and/or water salinity. The crop proposed is the triticale hybrid, and the paper compare principally this hybrid with barley who is one the most common cereal used for this soils in Jordan. I think that the paper is most a Short Communication that Original paper. The results are somewhat poor for an original work. The objective of this work It is unclear from between the abstract and the introduction. Nevertheless, the work is a contribution to the knowledge of the skills and productivity of triticale as a forage. This manuscript is acceptable for publication but I think that it could be reconsidered for publication as a short communication, after a minor revision	This comment will have a great impact on our attitude in relation to publishing. This advice must be taken in consideration, so we will recommend the Journal to consider the paper as a short communication rather than an original research paper in regarding ethical aspect. The aim of this short communication paper were unified in the major objective of the manuscript, it was mentioned twice both in the tail of abstract and in the tail of introduction. 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	The objective should be unified between the abstract and the introduction. The aim is to compare triticale with other cereals or propose a new triticale crop.	



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments		<i>Dear reviewer:</i> Thank you very much for all of your comments and advices. <i>Correspondent author</i>
---	--	---