



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_37686
Title of the Manuscript:	Agro-morphological diversity of six peanut (Arachis hypogaea L.) breeding lines from three geographical areas
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. Botanical classification needed: Spanish, Virginia, Valencia. A separate column for this parameter in the germplasm table is more informative 2. State of the seeds planted: Breeder seeds? Freshly harvested? This could have effects on the emergence dates 3. Dormancy versus non dormancy type: This have implication on emergence date. No mentioning of this aspect yet it is as important as botanical classification. A separate column for this parameter in the germplasm table is more informative 4. Elevation of the trial location (Altitude at masl): some of the pathogens flourishes well in certain altitude 5. Knowledge of the measurement sources: E.g. groundnuts descriptors is important 6. Leafspot: Which leafspot are we measuring here: Early or late 7. Soil condition: Need mentioning as well 8. Crop in rotation/previous crop: Need mentioning 9. Pictures output: too poor, use a better pasting method of the output. It is not informative in the current state 10. P values reported are outside the convention levels of the 5% (less than 1 in 20 chance of being wrong), 1% and 0.1% ($P < 0.05$, 0.01 and 0.001) levels. The p value of 0.0001 needs explaining (page 7). 11. Tables not fitting on one page make it less informative and difficult to read. This can be fixed in the final typesetting though 12. Mean 100 seed weight were under the 55 ± 2 is the standard scale for confectionery type. Hence non meet the confectionery market type 13. Correlate height with plant density inference: taller ones lodge more frequently. Same with branching 14. Table 6: Could have been much more informative if it fitted in one page (this is editorial function and setting anyway) 15. Rationale for fertilization: whether after a soil test analyses or just	1. Clarification was provided at this point 2. Clarification was provided at this point 3. Clarification was provided at this point 4. noted 5.reference quoted 6.These are both. when we mention leaf spot without precision it is both, otherwise we will specify if it is late or early (Subramanyam et al., 1995). 7.,8.Experiment was conducted at Gampêla district, soil condition was clarified and the previous crop was groundnut. 9. Clarification was provided at this point 10. this is an input mistake 11.; 14. just a layout problem, We are hopeful that this will be corrected by the Editor before publication. 12. no the confectionery type 13 Noted 15, Just blanket application needed.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	blanket application needed	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		