

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_118995
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of genetic variation for seed yield and quality attributing characters in Indian rapeseed and mustard
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.journaljeai.com/index.php/JEAI/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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. Yes</p> <p>2. it is better to include the scientific names along with common names in the title</p> <p>3. abstract needs changes</p> <p>4. The manuscript needed revision to be submitted in a scientific way, and some typographical errors</p> <p>5. yes, but the conclusion and present research work results not explain how it is helpful to the future line of work</p> <p>6. so, many references are too old, and better to add recent references</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Try to improve	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Noru Raja Sekhar Reddy
Department, University & Country	Kerala Agricultural University, India