



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_44212
Title of the Manuscript:	Multiple element isotopic analysis as a tool to discriminate the geographical origin of Ipomoea violácea
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>)

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	Abstract was well written with minor corrections. Introduction was well written with minor corrections. One heading for Materials and Methods is enough. Minor corrections as shown below.	
Minor REVISION comments	Aim: The importance of this study was not is Place and Duration of Study: Sample: The laboratory analyses were carried out at the Institute of Biosciences, Botucatu, Brazil, between January 2016 and December 2018. Methodology: Line 2: The samples were subjected to drying at 60°C for 48 hours in a forced ventilation oven. The dry parts..... Line 7: Isotopic analyses Line 8: Analyses were made in triplicates. Results: The results, not Our results.....Delete Figure 2; Table 3. This certified not certifies. INTRODUCTION Line 17: identification as well as already established Line 19: ... with bell-shaped Line:.....control. This makes it illegal... MATERIALS AND METHODS One sub-head is enough Line 43: These regions comprised the Brazilian cities of..... Line 51.....and is located 319 metres not meters Line 61: The plants' shoots were separated into leaves, flowers and seeds. Line 62: samples were subjected to drying Line 65: . This process consisted of submitting the samples..... Line 72: Isotopic analyses not analyses.....(IRMS), to determine..... Line 74: allowing the calculation of its isotopic composition (OX) using..... Line 78: the international standard value Line 87: For oxygen analysis, not analyses Line 90: Analyses were also made in triplicates.	All corrections accepted



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Line 91: standard was , not is Line 95: to define which isotope presented, not presents RESULTS Line 106: values of shoots Line 112:.....The first component represented 55 % information Line 113: and $\delta^{18}O$ was, not is Line 114: component represented 29 % information, and it was more influenced by $\delta^{15}N$. Line 123: analysis showed that leaf was Line 125: , the squared distances were..... Line 143:, hence they had not have Line 156: There were greater variations when compared with $\delta^{15}N$ values from a previous study (10). This was Line 158: difference was characterised..... Line 166: . This certified Line 172: could be possibly estimated on the basis of its Line 181: effective in the discrimination of <i>I. violacea</i>'s geographical origin.	
Optional/General comments	Well researched with significant contribution to knowledge.	

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	No, it didn't. In the year that the plants were collected, no authorization was required.