



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	MS: 2012 AJEA 2823
Title of the Manuscript:	ESTIMATION OF FIELD ENVIRONMENT VARIABILITY FOR GERMINATION AND SEEDLING TRAITS IN <i>MADHUCA INDICA</i> GMEL.

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 9 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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	No recent references on the topics addressed; Little reasoned discussion; The statistical used was unable to assess the differences between the phenotypes.	Added recent references meeting the requirements of the content both in context and reference section. Few citations for the reason that less work has been done in the estimation of field environment variability. 6. Snedecor GW, Cochran WG <i>Statistical method</i>, Oxford and IBH, New Delhi. 1967; 593 18. Kholsa PK, Sehgal RN, Dhall SP, Chauhan SK. Path coefficient analysis of correlation between shoot dry weight and other characteristics in <i>Pinus roxburghii</i> progeny. <i>Journal of tree science</i> 1985; 4(1):15-19 19. Ranjeet K, Gupta HK, Chauhan KC.



SDI Review Form 1.6

		Estimation of genetic and environmental variability for seedling traits in <i>pinus roxburghii</i>. 2006; 29 (2):125-128 20. Dhillions GPS, Gill RIS, Navneet K, Baljit S. Variation in seed parameters, germination behaviour and seedling traits among different seed sources of <i>jatropha curcas</i> Linn <i>Ann. For.</i> 2008; 16(1): 1-7 Discussion reasonably adequate meeting the need of the work done as referenced alongway If I can request for the revision of the context .The recorded observations were subjected to analysis of variance (ANOVA) to understand significant differences by using a software programme SPSS as briefed described in para last of materials and methods context.
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments	Conflict between data in Table 2 and results and discussion; Some plant species names written improperly.	Revision made proved no conflict between table 2 and results and discussion. If I have fully understood requesting for second kind look at the context.
Optional/General comments	Work with scientific merit and fit for publication after the suggested corrections.	