



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2014_AJEA_15139
Title of the Manuscript:	Variability of fruit and seed characters and oil content of 35 accessions of <i>Jatropha curcas</i> L. grown in a semi-aride site in Senegal
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

	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	1. The language of the manuscript is very poor and there are number of grammatical mistakes throughout the manuscript. At many places two or three words are typed together. 2. The results should be written in past tense. 3. Under tables put decimal (.) instead of comma (,) 4. What do author mean by methods of survey, as author has not conducted any survey? Simply the seeds were collected from the plantation. 5. What are we the basis of 1-4 years? Why not plants of same age were taken for the study? 6. A survey word has been put at many places in the manuscript for eg. In discussion-- This survey was conducted to quantify the variation in morphological----- . I think the author has not conducted any survey. Please correct it and also improve the English of the manuscript. 7. Page 8 line 129 to 138 are repetition of the data give in tables, therefore these lines may be deleted. 8. Similarly on page 14 line from 198 to 203 may be deleted or from table 5 accessions column may be deleted. 8. Author lack in making comprehension of data of the paper in conclusion part. There should be very specific findings in this section 9. There is no acknowledgments in this article, which indicated authors did not pay proper attention to ethical dimension of processing this paper for the publication	1) Language has been improved 2) Past tense has been used in results section 3) corrections has been done 4) the seeds were collected from the plantation 5) On 35 accessions studied only 6 (1, 17, 21, 32, 33 and 35) have 4-year-old trees. In the dendrogram we note that these accessions are dispersed between groups 1 (1, 21), 3 (35) 4 (17, 32) and 5 (33) 6) The word survey was removed from the text 7) The requested corrections have been done 8) We tried to satisfy the reviewer 9) Acknowledgments were added



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Spelling of aride ? arid	The requested corrections have been done
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		