



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Agriculture and Ecology Research International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAERI_35674
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECT OF TEMPERATURE REGIMES ON MORPHOLOGICAL DEVELOPMENT OF SELECTED CANOLA (Brassica napus) GENOTYPES
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>)



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>Review of the MS <b>EFFECT OF TEMPERATURE REGIMES ON MORPHOLOGICAL DEVELOPMENT OF SELECTED CANOLA (<i>Brassica napus</i>) GENOTYPES</b></p> <p>This aims of the manuscript were to determine the effect of temperature regimes on the morphological development of canola to exploit its productive potentials, and enhance its agronomic management.</p> <p><b>Abstract</b> section: is clear and informative. In the line 18 and 21, there are spaces where they should not be.</p> <p><b>Introduction</b> section: is too long, please add some more recent references.</p> <p><b>Materials and Methods</b> section is clear. I suggest statistic analyse where cultivar and temperature were both factors.</p> <p><b>Results</b> and <b>Discussion</b> section is too long. Results are written on telegraphic way and I miss more discussion, also with more references.</p> <p>Conclusion section is not enough focused. It does not completely answer the questions, put at the end of the Introduction section.</p> <p><b>Specific comments</b> Spaces are missing on many places or there are written two instead of one. Commas are written on the wrong places many times. References are written in different style in the text and in the Reference section. Thought the text: Author's names of the species should be written in captions, and not in italic! Please, check them Thought the text! Latin names should be written in italics!</p> <p><b>Introduction section</b> P1 L30 Brassica should be written in capital letter. P2 L 39 et al in the middle of the text? P3 L 89 influences instead of influence</p> <p><b>Materials and Method section</b> P4 L106 canola as treatment Is not clear P4 L 121 481.5 <math>\mu\text{molm}^{-2}\text{s}^{-1}</math> for outside environment. I would expect higher. P5 L 150 An appropriate analysis of variance (ANOVA)</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>was performed. What is an appropriate?</p> <p><b>Results and Discussion section</b>  P 9L 213 where-after is not clear  P14 L 311 produced per plant. Which plans?  P14 L 312 and other instead of and others  P16 L 349 for which plants?  P17 L 356 P=0???  P 17 L364 where is this statistics analyses seen in the Table 1?  P18 L379 1.8584 too many decimal numbers  P19 section 3.8.3 is written in different style comparing to other text  P20 Table 1 GS Mean???  Letters in the figures are not well seen in all figures!</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p>		
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Mateja Germ</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Ljubljana, Slovenia</b>