

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_107659
Title of the Manuscript:	PERFORMANCE OF VARIETIES ON THE YIELD AND QUALITY OF ONION (<i>Allium cepa</i> L.) THROUGH SET TO BULB METHOD
Type of the Article	

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> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5.</p> <p>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Somewhat</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Somewhat</p> <p>Somewhat</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Somewhat</p> <p>1. The readability of this paper requires improving. I have difficulty following the text. The whole text should have been paragraphed properly. In the current form, the entire text appears as a big lump, impairing its readability substantially. 2.The abstract unclear please rewrite abstract 3. The literature review on the recent progress for this research topic is not sufficient. 4. There must be a comparison between the previous work and work search 5.The conclusion unclear please rewrite conclusion 6. Research needs to be very modern and more references 7. The references need more arrangements Such as IEEE or Harvard</p>	
<p>MinorREVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>somewhat</p>	

Optional/General comments	<p>1. The readability of this paper requires improving. I have difficulty following the text. The whole text should have been paragraphed properly. In the current form, the entire text appears as a big lump, impairing its readability substantially.</p> <p>2. The abstract unclear please rewrite abstract</p> <p>3. The literature review on the recent progress for this research topic is not sufficient.</p> <p>4. There must be a comparison between the previous work and work search</p> <p>5. The conclusion unclear please rewrite conclusion</p> <p>6. Research needs to be very modern and more references</p> <p>7. The references need more arrangements such as IEEE or Harvard</p>	
----------------------------------	---	--

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:	Mohammed Aboud Kadhim
Department, University & Country	Middle Technical University, Iraq