

## Review Form 1.7

|                          |  |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name:            | <b>Journal of Experimental Agriculture International</b>                             |
| Manuscript Number:       | <b>Ms_JEAI_105959</b>  |
| Title of the Manuscript: | <b>PHYSIOLOGICAL PARAMETERS AND QUALITY OF POTATO UNDER DIFFERENT PLANTING DATES</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> )

### 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>Yes, taking into consideration the importance of the potato culture and the necessity to improve its performance as regard as crop productivity, as well as the crop yield quality.</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>As I recommended on the manuscript, the structure can be improved.</p> <p>I think so.</p> <p>Yes. But as I recommended on the manuscript the section needs to be carefully reviewed by the author. Instructions for authors need to be respected.</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>Yes.</p>   |   |
| <p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>  |   |   |

### 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) |
|--|---|---|
| <p><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p> | <p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p> |   |

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**Reviewer Details:**

|                                  |  |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Name:                            | <b>Delian Elena</b>  |
| Department, University & Country | <b>University of Agronomic Sciences and Veterinary Medicine, Romania</b> |