

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)	<p>Yes, it is important as it was for suitable planting of the oriental tobacco plants issues related with varieties.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>To some extent it is but it has to fulfil the all requirements at abstract level on which the reader can understand full things of the study.</p> <p>There are some missing parts; such as objectives are not in clear way, data collected, recommendations, experimental procedures and treatments.....</p> <p>They are not in references writing style, not in alphabetical order, not sufficient enough and some are very old</p> <p>Abstract doesn't show problem statement and objective, key words are not in alphabetical order, methodology part is not full enough. But result part is good.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	It is good	
Optional/General comments	To make soundly, adding some missing parts of introduction, methodology, in 4 should be conclusion and recommendation, revisiting of abstracts and reference parts	

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:	Taye Buke Ashango
Department, University & Country	Wolaita Sodo University, Ethiopia