

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_98547
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of Chrysopogon Aciculatus (Ritz.) Trin. Seed for Sod Production in Ghana: An Assessment of Growth Performance and Post Harvest Quality.
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	1. The presented article is practical and scientifically valuable for researchers, producers and consumers. 2. Yes, the title fits the content of the article. 3. The abstract provided is in acceptable condition. 4. Sections and sub-sections of the article have been compiled correctly. 5. The article is in good condition in terms of scientific structure. 6. The references used are acceptable in terms of quantity and quality.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The quality of the language of the article is suitable for scientific communication.	
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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mohammad Reza Zargaran Khouzani
Department, University & Country	Khuzestan University of Agricultural Sciences and Natural Resources, Iran