

Editor's comment :

The analyses were well done and were even more than needed. The real issue with the study is the insufficient and inefficient interpretation of the results that could have given more scientific value the work.

However, the paper makes some sense at its present state and can be considered for publication in the conditions stated in the Final decision file.

FINAL DECISION ON MANUSCRIPT Ms_JEAI_43425

I wish to inform you that that the manuscript entitled "*Genetic diversity among accessions of Calotropis procera based on agronomic characters*" has used established methods to assess the genetic variability within 70 natural *C. procera* accessions for the selection of well performing ones for introgression in the crop breeding programme and conservation for posterity.

The goals were achieved in the authors' mind and most probably in their backyard work. Unfortunately, the manuscript doesn't allow readers to share the same feeling. Few reasons can be given to support our statement including (i) an abstract not providing figures on the genetic variability obtained, (ii) a lack of a table showing the mean values of agronomic characters for the 9 accessions selected with reference to the corresponding overall means.

Although several cluster analyses methods can be performed in a working sheet, it is advisable to select one or two which better help directing hybridization of accessions selected in the breeding process.

The Journal of Experimental Agriculture International can be advised to publish the manuscript provided that (i) a table showing the performances of accessions selected is inserted in the section **Results and discussion** towards the end of the section, and (ii) comments made in the revised version of the manuscript attached herewith this e-mail are considered.

Author's comment :

The authors agree with the reviewer and the manuscript has been corrected. Was inserted a table with the averages of the selected accesses.