

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_99780
Title of the Manuscript:	Results of trial transplanting of Oriental tobacco varieties in Dak Lak province, Vietnam in 2022
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] Yes 2] Yes suitable 3] Moderate 4] Manuscript sections were appropriate 5] Yes, its scientifically correct 6] References were listed in the text not according to those mentioned in reference list. 1] Abstract should be with structural fields 2] References arrangement (not ordered as they appear in the text) 3] Abbreviations were not mentioned 4] Chemical formulations description required (only chemical formulas were mentioned, in narrative also) 5] Every reference referred in the reference list must also present in the text (05 and 10 references were not available in text) 7] More than 6 authors were listed 8] Double spacing not maintained for all tables 9] Key words were not sufficient and were inappropriate (do not use a place/location as a keyword)	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language should be modified. Abstract and whole manuscript had information regarding past but mentioned in present sentence.	
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:	Akhila Janga
Department, University & Country	Kakatiya University, India