



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_49522
Title of the Manuscript:	GENETIC VARIABILITY AND CHARACTER ASSOCIATION FOR OIL YIELD AND ITS COMPONENTS IN PHYSIC NUT (<i>Jatropha curcas</i> L)
Type of the 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
after

	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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Title – put it point after “<i>Jatropha curcas</i> L” as “<i>Jatropha curcas</i> L.” 2. Abstract – please put it the initial of the species author as “(<i>Jatropha curcas</i> L.) because there is mentioned for the first time; for plant height please write the measure unit “(13.36)”.. 3. Introduction – Paragraph 2: “<i>Jatropha curcas</i>” is wrote with whole name of genus and species in Paragraph 1, therefore further could be write as “<i>J. curcas</i>”; Paragraph 1: after [1, 2] should be quoted [3], not going on [4]; Paragraph 2: delete the point “in carbon sequestration. [7]”; Paragraph 3: The authors skip the literature listed under number [10] and went directly to Jubera [11]. 4. Materials and Methods – Paragraph 1: please indicate the GPS coordinates correctly, missed seconds “(7⁰ 16' N, 5⁰ 12' E)”; Paragraph 2: please write correctly the species name “<i>Jatropha</i>” as “<i>J. curcas</i>”; Paragraph 2: after “(WAP): are listed the investigated characters, please put this punctuation mark “ ” or “ ” after each character, because somewhere is missed; after “Siva-Subramanian and Menon [14], delete the comma, it is inadequate and put this mark “ ”; the same suggestion for “heritability percentage” *put at the end of the sentence this mark “ ”; Format the categories for “GCV and PCV”, “GA” and “Analysis of covariance” how they are for “Broad sense heritability” and “Heritability percentage”; 5. Results – Paragraph 1: please write “Seed” with small first letter; Paragraph 2: please write “<i>J. Curcas</i>” with small first letter as “<i>J. curcas</i>”; Paragraph 2: please write the measure unit next to the result number “45.96”; Paragraph 2: whether should be write the measure unit next to the result number for the plant height “...and plant height (13.36)”. 6. Discussion – Paragraph 2: please replace “were” with “was”; Paragraph 3: please replace “<i>Jatropha curcas</i>” with “<i>J. curcas</i>”; please leave the space in the title of Table 1 “forty<i>J. curcas</i>”; Why, after Table 1, the authors write the explanatory shortcuts when the whole name is given in the table of the test characters? It does not make sense unless the authors have typed the shortcuts that are not so in this case !!!; Why, after Table 1, the authors write the explanatory abbreviations when the whole name is given in the table of the tested characters? It does not make sense unless the authors have written the abbreviations in the table that are not so in this case !!! In Table 2, 3 and 4 must be written under the same name the tested character “Number of Seeds” as in Table 1 “Number of Seeds per Plant”; This suggestion is referred on written name of tested characters: all with the first uppercase or all with a lowercase); in the title of the Table 4 please replace “40” with the word “forty”. 	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>The authors should check the whole manuscript concern the indication of literature in brackets that should be in succession. Skips were found in several places.</p> <p>The authors should write the measure units unified through the whole manuscript, namely somewhere is written next to the number without space (110cm), somewhere is written with left space (180.29 cm).</p> <p>The authors should revised the Manuscript and everywhere replace “[24; 20]” with “[24, 20]” (please use comma “ ” not “ ”)</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	The authors must unify the signification level markings (in the Materials and Methods is given as $P \leq 0.05$, under Table 1 as $p < 0.05$; $p < 0.01$, under Table 4 is given as “*, ** significant at 0.05, 0.01 probability level respectively”)!	
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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Suzana Jordanovska
Department, University & Country	Institute of Agriculture in Skopje, Ss. Cyril and Methodius University , Macedonia