



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

**PART 1:**

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

**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) |
|--------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments | <p>No recent references on the topics addressed;</p> <p>Little reasoned discussion;</p> <p>The statistical used was unable to assess the differences between the phenotypes.</p> |                                                                                                                                                                               |
| <b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments      | <p>Conflict between data in Table 2 and results and discussion;</p> <p>Some plant species names written improperly.</p>                                                          |                                                                                                                                                                               |
| <b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments    | <p>Work with scientific merit and fit for publication after the suggested corrections.</p>                                                                                       |                                                                                                                                                                               |

**Note: Anonymous Reviewer**