



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

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 Article	Short communication

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
1. Good job with the revisions. 2. "the other big advantages" – capitalize first word. 3. "An analysis of variance was made for the measured parameters using manual t-value calculations." – I am not 100% sure what you mean by manual t-value calculations? Did you do the ANOVA by hand? Or did you do T tests? If you did it by hand then I would just say "An analysis of variance was made for the measured parameters". If you used T-tests then you should say so and then correct for multiple comparisons, as t-tests and anova are very different. It sounds like this might be the case given your #6. Don't say ANOVA if its not really anova. 4. Graph 1 – label y axis, legend not sufficient. 5. I could have missed this, but if you did statistics, I would think your reader would like to see them. Add T-values and such. 6. Please, do not report two things as "significantly different" if only one sample was collected. It seems to me that you have enough data to do stats on ADF, etc. However, 7. ***The yields as you describe in you attachment and in the paper, while containing 0.1 ha of material, actually represent 1 data point. Stats cannot be done on one datapoint, and it would be much better to describe the differences but remove all references to "Sig *" and significant. Trust me, your reader will be smart enough to know that there is only one replicate for each sample. 8. I would also add that the job of a reviewer is to suggest improvements to a manuscript. If a reviewer finds something confusing, a reader will too. I feel that you have adequately cleared up most of the items in the text that I commented on (e.g., adding "Syria-1"), but please remember that the goal is to provide you suggestions 9. As a final suggestion, the last thing your reader will see, and in fact where they might go to see your main "take home message" is the conclusion. There are a number of sentence fragments there and other grammatical issues. You could also restate your points in a more compelling way. Take it or leave it...just a my	1. <u>My pleasure.</u> 2. "The other big advantages" : t capitalized T. (Dan_v1_2) 3. ANOVA not used, just t-test using excel data analysis (two samples of equal variance) (Dan_v1_3) please, check the paragraph prior to "results and discussion". 4. Graph 1: y axis was labelled very well. (Dan_v2_4) 5. T-values (Statistical and Critical) added beneath each parameter measured (Dan_v1_5). 6. Significantly different, significant, Sig, and * removed from abstract, results and discussion. It just removed without labelling. But, significant term used only in literature citing both in the introduction and "results & discussion". Please note that (Dan_v1_6*7) was highlighted the term (significant) that remain within all paper in the previous specific sites. 7. <u>Every comment you recommend previously was followed without any hesitations. We are greatly trust your experience and guidance.</u> 8. The sentence " pronounced and disseminated to whole country.." replaced by your suggestion " Saline conditions are common in Jordan and these results suggest that triticale might be a productive crop in these areas..." (Dan_v1_8) 9. <u>Dear reviewer: we respect all of your deep looking. and viewpoints thanks a lot.</u> Specific Note: First line of acknowledgments was added.



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

own opinion. About your #30, I would try to provide a suggestion but Im not totally sure what you are trying to convey by “pronounced and disseminated to whole country” Maybe you mean something like “Saline conditions are common in Jordan and these results suggest that triticale might be a productive crop in these areas...?”

In conclusion, I think the paper has been reworked well. I still find a few things that I suggest the author clean up. “significant” and “*” and “statistically significant” should be reserved for cases where actual statistics can be reported (and they should be). I think it is very interesting.

There are a few comments, particularly with regard to presentation of statistics.