SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural and Horticultural Research
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJAHR_46168**
Title of the Manuscript:	**EVALUATION OF SOME MORPHOLOGICAL AND FLOWERING TRAITS IN NEW SIX OLIVE GENOTYPES GROWN UNDER EGYPT CONDITIONS**
Type of the Article	**1. Original research papers**

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 The paper is important as it provides information to improve the productivity of the olive tree in Egypt.	**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	The objective of work is clear and precise. In the materials and methods in Table 2, the units of the water analysis are not listed, it is not known if they are meq / l or mg / l. The materials and methods are very well described and very detailed In the section Surface area of the canopy (m2), it is stated that "the genotype of the olive tree (61 and 91) detected the greatest increase in the surface area of the canopy in the first and second seasons, respectively" which is not true the statistical point of view since there is no difference between the genotype 91, 97 and 25 in 2016 and in 2017 the 97 and 25 have no differences. The results are presented in a very complete way, unlike the conclusions that are very poor, no reference is made to the possible differences between years for the same crop due to meteorological conditions.	**Thank you very much for your valuable I comments i have checked all your valuable commentes thanks very much for all this**
Minor REVISION comments	The paper in general is well presented, we must review the interpretation of some results that do not match the data in the tables, which is surely an error due to the large amount of information to be analyzed. The conclusions should also be reformulated	
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)*	**Thank you very much for your valuable I comments i have checked all your valuable commentes thanks very much for all this**

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.
Kindly see the following link:
http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20