



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_46119
Title of the Manuscript:	Biometrical assessment of urucum quantitative features (Bixa orellana L.) in the northeastern Brazil
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>)

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>The Title, Abstract, Introduction, Materials and Methods, Results and Discussion, Tables, Figures, Conclusion and References have been well reviewed. The minor errors identified in this work were a lot and noted down, however, the following important observations were identified as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Materials and Methods show that there was no experiment carried out, there was merely the measurement of the lengths and widths of 300 urucum seeds which is more of pure statistical work. 2. It could be deduced from the Results and Discussion that this article is more of Advanced Biostatistics than Plant Breeding or Genetics experimental work, and it could fit into Pure Biostatistical, Biometrical or Statistical Journals. 3. The author(s) relates the work to textbooks of Statistics and not to past research findings. About 70% of the 24 references cited are Textbooks of Statistics. 4. There is no clearly outlined and definite genetic finding in the lengths and widths of urucum seeds, mainly statistical results were undertaken. 5. The conclusion drawn out from this research work does not show any measurable and relevant results. 	We agree with the comments
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	There are no ethical issues in this manuscript