

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_95791
Title of the Manuscript:	Development and Productivity of 'Red torch' and 'Pink torch' Cultivars of Torch Ginger
Type of the Article	Original Research 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 manuscript is important for scientific community. The characterization of the development, yield, and morphological characteristics of the 'Red torch' and 'Pink torch' cultivars of torch ginger use full to cultivate both. 2. The title of the article is not suitable I suggest the title is "Study of 'Red torch' and 'Pink torch' Cultivars of Torch Ginger." 3. The abstract of the article is comprehensive 4. Subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate 5. I think the manuscript is scientifically correct 6. The references are sufficient and recent	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The Language/English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications.	
Optional/General comments	This manuscript is well written	

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:	Warji
Department, University & Country	Universitas Lampung, Indonesia