

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_110540
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of potato (<i>Solanum tuberosum</i> L.) for yield and quality production under natural farming system in gird region of Madhya Pradesh
Type of the Article	

Review Form 1.7

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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Yes, it may contribute 2. Title is better 3. Assessment of potato (<i>Solanum tuberosum</i> L.) performance for yield and quality production under natural farming system in gird region of Madhya Pradesh 4. Yes, it was well presented 5. Yes, I do, with serious modification 6. No, it needs detail revision by adding in text citation starting from the introduction to the result and discussion parts. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	It is normal	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>GENERAL COMMENT</p> <p>#1- Abstract lacks objective of the study, data analysis method, and final recommendation</p> <p>#2- The manuscript lacks citation in the introduction part; it needs serious revision.</p> <p>#3- Result and Discussion;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It presented and discussed in shallow • It lacks comparison/support of other related finding • Thus, the result and discussion part need serious and detail revision by supporting the finding with other finding. • In the tabulated(table) data <p>-Mean separation is not indicated; thus mean of the treatment need to indicate significance variation by writing letters (a,b,c,ab,bc, as per signi..) by superscripting letters, as I tried to indicate in Table 1 and 2.</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:	Tesfaye Lishan
Department, University & Country	Mizan Tepi University, Ethiopia