

## Review Form 1.7

|                          |   |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name:            | <b>Journal of Experimental Agriculture International</b>                                      |
| Manuscript Number:       | <b>Ms_JEAI_95791</b>  |
| Title of the Manuscript: | <b>Development and Productivity of 'Red torch' and 'Pink torch' Cultivars of Torch Ginger</b> |
| Type of the Article      | <b>Original Research Article</b>  |

### **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> )

**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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b><br/>(Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b><br/>(If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p> | <p style="text-align: center;">YES</p> <p style="text-align: center;">YES</p> <p style="text-align: center;">YES</p> <p style="text-align: center;">YES</p> <p style="text-align: center;">YES</p> <p style="text-align: center;">YES</p>  |   |
| <p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>   | <p>Generally speaking, yes.</p>  |   |
| <p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>  | <p>Page 1, Abstract, Results paragraph, 5th line: Where it says, "In this study, found" it should say "In this study, <b>we</b> found..."</p> <p>Page 1, Abstract, Results paragraph, 6<sup>th</sup> line: Where it says, " Pink Torch' show high..." it should say "Pink Torch' <b>showed</b> high..."</p> <p>Page 3, first paragraph, 7<sup>th</sup> line, where it says, "(°C), were monitored..." it should say "<b>they</b> were monitored..."</p> <p>Page 4, Fig. 2 graphs should have more resolution, notations can hardly be seen..</p> <p>Page 4, first paragraph, 1<sup>st</sup> line: where it says, "showed precocity compared" it should say "showed precocity <b>as</b> compared..."</p> <p>Page 4. Last paragraph, 2<sup>nd</sup> line, where it says, "is a plant demanding of water humidity" it should say "<b>is a water and humidity demanding plant...</b>"</p> <p>Page 5, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph, 5<sup>th</sup> line, where it says, "availability of water during in period" it should say, "availability of water during <b>this</b> period..."</p> <p>Page 5, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph, 9<sup>th</sup> line, where it says, "prior the highest tiller..." it should say "prior <b>to</b> the highest tiller..."</p> <p>Page 5, 4<sup>th</sup> paragraph, 3<sup>rd</sup> line, where it says, "these periods in related to the influence..." it should say "these periods <b>is</b> related to the influence..."</p> <p>Page 5, 5<sup>th</sup> paragraph, 3<sup>rd</sup> line, where it says, "this cultivar was characterized low clump...", it should say "this cultivar was characterized <b>by a</b> low clump..."</p> <p>Page 5, 5<sup>th</sup> paragraph, 5<sup>th</sup> line, where it says "region, obtained an average..." it should say "region, <b>we</b> obtained an average..."</p> <p>Page 5, 6<sup>th</sup> paragraph, 2<sup>nd</sup> line, where it says, "higher than observed...", it should say "higher than <b>the one</b> observed..."</p> <p>Page 5, 6<sup>th</sup> paragraph, 4<sup>th</sup> line, where it says, "can be attributed to fact that...", it should say "can be attributed to <b>the</b> fact..."</p> <p>Page 8, References: I could not find citations 17 nor 18 in the text.</p> |   |

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

|                                  |   |
|----------------------------------|---|
| Name:                            | <b>María de Lourdes Yáñez López</b>               |
| Department, University & Country | <b>Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana, Mexico</b> |