Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JEAI_38569**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Responses of Castor Beans Hybrids Produced by the Conventional Method and by the Cryptic Hybrid Method**
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	The justification of the study is not coming out. What is currently known with regards to grain productivity, oil content and oil productivity in literature and where is the gap, you want to address? Why did you settle for these three parameters? It should be explained. Line 76- Check your sentence, the experiment is not developed, its laid out. On line 21, 2.3 Data Collection- Please indicate the stages at which each parameter was measured. On tables 1, 3, and 5 indicate the degrees of freedom, and all abbreviations should be explained in full as a foot note. Tables should be self-explanatory. Are values in this tables, mean squares? It should be explained. Sentence beginning in line 233, up to line 235- The explanation for G x E is vague, please improve the sentence. G x E explains the performance of genotypes across location with relative to others. In line 245 a sentence- '…… to show that the means of genotypes are not at all *bad.*' Please quantify what you mean by "bad" Sentence 356 to 358 is not clear. How can the height of genotypes be interesting because of several scientific studies? Review the sentence Line 405 to 407. Review the sentence. How can the height be classified as low and what do you mean by excellent productivities? Reference to previous work done in relation to what has been found out is inadequate in the "Results and Discussion" section The author should be conscious in his conclusion. The results show that across genotypes there were a couple of genotypes in the Cryptic group which did not differ significantly with those in the conventional group in each and across locations in all measured parameters. The fact that the mean was higher for Cryptic hybrids than for conventional hybrids in all parameters except for one parameter (Table 4) in one season, does not guarantee the author to use a blanket conclusion that Cryptic hybrids were better. More over it was not tabulated to find out if these means between (Cryptic hybrids and Conventional hybrids) were significantly different from each other- This should be done The author should be conscious in his suggestion. He/ she should predict that Cryptic hybrids are better but more experiments should be carried out	Ok noted
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		