



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	Materiai and methods section is not to be enough to understand clearly the manuscript. In this section; information about sowing species, cultivars, sowing ratio, row spacing, fertiliser must be give. Statistical analysis was not expressed. In table ndf content of seed was too high. I think that there was some problem these value.	1. In the Materials and Methods there were two modifications according to a reviewer comments: A. First one: First paragraph which was added below " Plant materials and growth conditions". B. Second one: Final paragraph which was added at the end of this section. In relation to NDF value, this value given by the laboratory tests, we have no option to modify this value. 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.