



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	<u>American Journal of Experimental Agriculture</u>
Manuscript Number:	2013_AJEA_5069
Title of the Manuscript:	Soybean (Glycine max .L) genotype and environment interaction effect on yield and other related traits
Type of the Article	Research paper

General guideline for Peer Review process is available in this link:

[\(http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline\)](http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline)

- This form has total 7 parts. Kindly note that you should use all the parts of this review form.



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2: 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		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Apparently one of the genotypes is called both TGx1937-1F and TGx1937-2F in various places. This needs to be explained or corrected. Table 1 adds up to 147 df, whereas the total should be 149. The discrepancy appears to be SxY, with 2 df that should be 4 df. The mean squares and significance values in that row of the table may need correction. Also, please check whether sources for "Replication" and "Pool error" (better, "Pooled error") are the best way to give results for a replicated split-plot design. Table 2 would communicate better if in each column the genotype with the best value had its value bolded, for instance, in the first column bold the winner 1.86. It is unclear why the CV% is given only for the last column. And the values for SE, Genotypes, Environments, and GxE are not explained – are they SS or MS or what?	The genotype is called TGx 1937-1F, not TGx 1937-2F. Pooled degree of freedom is 149 not 147. - Values of significance in all the three table bolded. - All the suggestions, comments, corrections on the manuscript AJEA 5069 were carryout as pointed by the reviewer. - The discussion seems lengthy and reviewer's intervention is accepted.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	In Table 2 it is striking that different genotypes win in different years. Is there some agricultural explanation, such as a dry year and a wet year? Line 144. The comment from Gebeyehu and Assefa (2003) does not seem at all helpful. Sure the average of many lines varies less than the single highest-yielding genotype, but that seems irrelevant regarding the task of recommending the best genotypes to plant. Line 171. Only the last sentence of this paragraph has merit. There are dozens of stability concepts, which means that this topic of “stability” must be engaged in great detail or else not at all. The present very brief mention of “stability” would probably not be comprehensible to most readers of this journal.	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments	My main suggestion is that the authors consider adding a principal component analysis (PCA) biplot to show the relationships among the 9 traits. The input matrix could be the 9 x 5 matrix in Table 3 (although there are other possibilities too, such as 9 traits by 50 observations where these observations are genotype-sowing-year combinations averaged over the 3 replications). The most important trait is seed yield, but a PCA biplot would give a nice overview of how seed yield is related to these other traits.	- Correlation coefficient analysis is carried out and the author used it to define the association between yield and yield related traits.
---	--	--