

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_30460
Title of the Manuscript:	Studies on percentage oil content variability and genetic divergence analysis of <i>Prunus armeniaca</i> L. (Wild Apricot) in Kashmir and Ladakh regions of India.
Type of the Article	Scientific 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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	-A principal component analysis (ACP) would be very usefull in such work and it will easily distinct between genotypes and among groups. -A mean comparison test (Duncan, ...) is necessary to distinct between significant differences in table 1 and table 2 . -Standard deviation need to be added in figure 1. -A figure representing the clusters and groups (I, II, III, IV,...) would be preferable	Not necessary, this is not a comparison study between genotypes and among groups Significant differences were calculated in table 2 by ANOVA and table 1 shows passport details only. Done as per need of the subject Not mandatory
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Abstract: -Citing the name of the faculty and the project are not necessary at this level.	Removed from abstract Randomised block design (done)

	-RBD initials are to be clarified Materials and methods Steps of k have to be written as a paragraph not in 1,2,.... steps. Information about trees location has to be in this part. Results and discussion In part iii) the author considered individuals as families Or a tree could not represent a family or a population. Conclusion The last paragraph in the conclusion has to be added to the discussion as it is not recommended to use references in this part of the paper	Framed in paragraph (done) Done as in table 1 Trees were selected in uniform stand on tree check method Done
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Presenting results of 2 or 3 consecutive years is generally advised for getting scientific conclusions especially when dealing with morphological characteristics.	I agree, the data of 2 years was first averaged then analysed statistically for convenient and direct interpretation of parameters studied