



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEA_29099
Title of the Manuscript:	Characterization of the Water Economy of Sugarcane Transgenic Genotypes
Type of the Article	Short 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 <i>(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)</i>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	The manuscript was written well. However, I have lot of concerns with respect to support of research methods to the conclusions drawn. Line 45: Gene construct(s) was used for transformation?. Is there any relation between gene construct and drought tolerance? Transformation method and regeneration method used? Is there any effect due to regeneration and growth of the plant? All transgenic lines are independent lines or clones? Line 48: How will you differentiate common genotype and genetic background? If the word "genetic background" is interchangeable with "common genotype" as in results and discussion section then it should be clarified. Line 65: The growth stage of the plant during water stress? Line67: The amount of water reduced during second phase (in terms of water quantity) Line 95: Due to coldest period of the experiment, the whole-plant transpiration rate is highly influenced, how will account this when draw a conclusion? Line 102: $P=0.0817$ is significant means what is the cut of value for declaring significant. Line 103: The genetic background definition is different from M&M section. Line 111: Table 1. Whole plant dry biomass of all transgenic lines was higher than respective genetic backgrounds. Is there any relation to transformation protocol or regeneration method for this effect?	



SDI Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments	The picture of the experiment can be included The standard error of the biomass data can be provided	
Optional/General comments	The experiment can be repeated at least one more time during sugarcane growing period to draw a conclusion	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Baskaran Kannan</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Agronomy Department, University of Florida, USA</i>