SCIENCEDOMAIN *international*
www.sciencedomain.org

SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	**American Journal of Experimental Agriculture**
Manuscript Number:	**2013_AJEA_4049**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Growth and dry matter partitioning of common bean (Phaseolus vulgaris, L) genotypes as influenced by aluminum toxicity**
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)

- 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, corrects the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)*
Compulsory REVISION comments Major Revision comments	**After correction of the mistakes indicated below, I suggest the paper for publication** The abstract, introduction and materials and method sections are well written. As compared to them, the results and discussion sections are poor. I suggest rewriting it more precisely. For example: L279 suggested the differences in Al levels of leaves. Which parameters present these data? How was the Al content of leaves measured? Indeed, you talk about the altered proportion of plant segments under different Al treatments, don't it? The nomenclature used is sometimes misleading: the authors talk about the effect of Al or acid soil (L317, L403, L427). Please be consequent! The 3.2 section is unnecessarily large and obscure. The figure legend at Fig.4 isn't precise. Is the fig.4 absolutely necessary? If not, I suggest eliminating it. Proposal: I suggest presenting the absolute values (g) of DW instead of % in Fig.5. Otherwise, the fig 6 seems only the recalculation of data found in Fig.5. It should be indicated better which parameters were measured in field experiments and which are found in pot experiments.	L279 indicates dry matter partitioned to the leaves not the aluminium content of the levels. corrected according to the comments given Corrected Corrected according to the comments given here This experiment was conducted only on pot not on field. L357 and L371 also corrected as the given

	The references are indicated numerically in the text, but the numbers are missing in the reference section. Is it correct? In many cases (L357, L371) the explanation of the results is not confirm experimentally. The better Al tolerance of BILFA 58 is explained in L398-400. But the potential mechanisms (internal detoxification or external exclusion) for Al tolerance were not investigated yet. Therefore, the real reason is not known.	comments. For L398- 400) comments as it indicted in the result the real reason for potential mechanism of tolerance, which will be investigated in the future
Minor REVISION comments	L8: the numbers after the names are not correct, please check it. (3 is missing) L14: usually, one university is not indicated by two numbers. L134-135: Please, cite a literature indicating the growth type II and II. L154: please indicate the pH of tap water. L131: indicated two types of experiment: performed in the field, and in pots. It seems that 2.4 belong to pot and 2.5 to filed experiments. I suggest indicating it in the titles. L255 indicated Fig.4. but L 258 Fig3b. I suggest modifying the Fig3b to Fig.4 (and if it is not absolutely necessary, eliminate the present Fig.4)	All the comments given here are corrected according to the reviewers except the comment given in L131, which is not part of this paper.
Optional/General comments	The general conclusions are not new, except that new BILA 58 genotype was used for the investigation. The results confirm the previous knowledge.	It is true that there are a lot of works on aluminium toxicity effect on crops which are mainly focused on root but there is scarce information in the world about the effect of aluminium on the aerial part of the plant.