

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advances in Agricultural Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAAR_93557
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECTS OF SEED PROVENANCE ON PLANT ESTABLISHMENT INDEX, SEEDLING VIGOR INDEX AND SPEED OF GERMINATION OF PHYSIC NUT (<i>Jatropha curcas</i> L.) IN SOKOTO STATE, NIGERIA
Type of the 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:

(<https://www.journalajaar.com/index.php/AJAAR/editorial-policy>)

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	<p>I believe that the manuscript can be taken as "short communication" and not as a full article. Each field experiment requires three, or at the very least two, growing seasons. The experiments were not performed in laboratory conditions, therefore they should be repeated, for at least one season. We do not know what and how the climatic conditions, such as rainfall, temperature, air, humidity, etc. influenced the germination, and this is not indicated in the manuscript.</p> <p>Introduction: It is better to provide more information about the morphology, ecology or utility of the species in question, rather than focusing on synonyms.</p> <p>Methodology: it is stated that soil samples have been taken, but the results do not contain any information about this or any analysis related to soil.</p> <p>No pattern. In the experiment, reference seeds should be added for comparison.</p> <p>Results:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The results said that the seed weight may play a role in the performance of the accession of SE1. Therefore, the seed weight of all the accession must be reported so that the reader can see the differences in this matter. What does the author understand by "better field performance"? And can this be talked about only when germination has been examined? <p>Conclusions: I believe you cannot write a "conclusion" by examining 16 accessions in one growing season. In this case, it is better to only indicate the probable better variants, i.e. the supposed "better seed accessions". Three accessions based on just one-time field experiment cannot be recommended for further cultivation. More discussion are required.</p> <p>References: Three items from the literature are not cited in the text. Several names of the authors are incorrectly mentioned in the text. Please revise everything.</p> <p>The idea of the manuscript is good. The methodology shows that the work has been done, but it is still not enough to write an article, so I propose reviewing according to the given suggestions and present the manuscript as "short communication" or repeat the experiment next season in order to compare and make the right conclusions.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

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>	

[Review Form 1.6](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Denise F. Dostatny
Department, University & Country	National Institute for Horticultural Research, Poland