

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_113521
Title of the Manuscript:	Uses of Gibberellic Acid for increasing grape production
Type of the 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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? Yes (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable?Yes (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Needs some corrections Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?Yes Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Yes,after making corrections Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> This review discussed the applications of using gibberellic acid in improving grape productivity. The author reviewed a number of previous studies on the subject, which indicated the importance of using gibberellic acid in improving grape growth and productivity. Figures 1, 2, 3, and 4. The reference from which these figures are cited must be indicated Tables 1 and 2, the word No. is deleted and the reference from which these tables are cited must be mentioned. There are some typos , format errors and grammatical errors need to be checked and the writer needs to re-examine about the arrangement of sentences. The summary needs to be rewritten, and the purpose of the review should be clearly stated at the end of the introduction. Based on the conclusions of the research, the authors need to add a description of suggestions and added value for other researchers or readers. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? needs to be chacked 		
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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:	Dhia Ahmed Taain
Department, University & Country	University of Basrah, Iraq