



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_34438
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of withholding water during grain filling on deoxynivalenol concentration and grain quality parameters of UK winter wheat genotypes
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		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	- In RESULTS Section (Page 6: 3.1): In the ANOVA analysis, when $p > 0.05$ and while choosing probability level of 5%, the statistical differences are not significant between genotypes or treatments. So the authors cannot say "approached significance" especially while $p = 0.08$. However, the "mean comparisons analysis" can be used to identify some genotypes that have special patterns in comparison with the overall mean. - The authors describe the pattern of some genotypes for some parameters only. However, the comparison is not supported by statistical basis: I suggest adding at least the "overall mean" in Tables 2 and 3 and "standard deviation" for each parameter and each treatment or add "mean comparison analysis" - Page 6 (RESULTS: 3.1): The author said "High HFN was observed in Oakley, SR 53, Maris Widgeon genotypes regardless of the level of FHB infection": I cannot find the FHB infection information in the manuscript?". The authors use those "not shown data of infection" as primordial support in the manuscript. It will be more interesting to include % of FSH infection at field to compare with DON and quality data. -The statistical analysis used in the study seems not sufficient. There is a need to go deeper in the analysis. Some suggestions are : * add means comparisons between genotypes (or treatments) to identify the outliers when found (primordial)	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	* add correlation analysis between the different parameters studied (important information); * add Principal components analysis for each treatment (Shelter or not shelter) to visualize first those correlations and second to get the groups of genotypes depending on their quality and DON characteristics (optional to summarize the results from almost all analysis). - In the DISCUSSION Section (Page 7), the authors used mean relative humidity and Temperatures to describe treatments conditions at grain filling period: The mean values should be accompanied by standard deviation or variation; or at least if not available add border temperatures (min and max) for each treatment to assess the contrast of climatic conditions between treatments. Those data should be preferably described in the RESULTS section. If authors have soil humidity data, they will support greatly the environmental conditions. - The Discussion Section is rich in terms of references. However, the results obtained from this manuscript should be clearly pointed and included in this section (especially when applying the additional analysis suggested) in order to exploit and highlight more the outputs of the current study.	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

Optional/General comments	- The manuscript subject is interesting and rich of data; However, those data are not fully and properly exploited by the statistical analysis to be used in Discussion and in comparison with previous studies (See Minor Revisions Comments). - It is preferable to add a paragraph after ABSTRACT to describe ABBREVIATIONS used in the manuscript to facilitate the comprehension while reading. -The “Material and Methods” section is describing minutely the different steps of the experiment. -Page 4: It is preferable to organize the data “about management practices of the field trial” in Table to make information clearer and easier to find. -Page 5 (paragraph 2.2): Separate paragraphs: one for each parameter to make clear each parameter measured and the corresponding experimental protocol.	
----------------------------------	---	--

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sahar Bennani
Department, University & Country	Plant breeding and Genetic Resources Conservation Department, National Institute of Agricultural Research, Morocco