



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Agriculture and Ecology Research International
Manuscript Number:	2014_JAERI_14640
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of Pearl millet Varieties for Adaptation to the Semi-Arid Agro-Ecology in Northern Ghana
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	The manuscript reviewed has many small mistakes of fact (e.g., the biofortified pearl millet genotypes evaluated in this study are all open-pollinated varieties – none of them are hybrids), mis-spellings of variety names, (e.g., the repeated mis-spelling of variety name “SOSAT-C88”), and typographical errors (e.g., the repeated capitalization of the “P” in “pearl millet”, regardless of where this word is found in a sentence or reference) ... that should be corrected before this article is accepted for publication. I have indicated many of the needed corrections at appropriate places in the annotated pdf, which accompanies these reviewer's comments. The economic analysis attempted is a gross ever-simplification that is biased in favour of the higher-yielding varieties, and its limitations need to be clearly indicated as a footnote to the table presenting the results of this. Further, the analysis assumes that pearl millet stover has no economic value, which is no longer so – even if the economic value of pearl millet stover in the UER of Ghana is relatively low compared to that of grain. This too needs to be indicated in the discussion of the results of the economic analysis. Several relevant references to pearl millet downy	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	mildew and screening for resistance to this disease are not referred to in this manuscript, but probably should be. Similarly, there are no references for the pearl millet genotypes tested and few references to the high grain Zn and Fe content of pearl millet. I have provided brief list of relevant references (in a balloon at the start of the reference list) that could be cited for these three points. Finally, the formats of the references need some modest work to bring them uniformly into the journal's style.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	C Tom Hash
Department, University & Country	ICRISAT Dryland Cereals Research Program, ICRISAT Sahelian Center, Niamey, NIGER (via Paris), Nigeria