



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_31324
Title of the Manuscript:	Forage Resources in the Semi-Arid Region of Setif : Diagnosis and Status
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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

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	The proposed for review manuscript considered a very important question related with the valuation of plant genetic resources (forage and pastoral interest species) in the Semi-Arid Region. Presented appropriate solutions for good agricultural practice and for the possibility to analyze the current situation of forage resources in the semi-arid regions in Algeria. Abstract is clear, informative, brief and representative of the work and underlines the significance of the subject. Introduction is understandable, clear and comprehensive exposing the reader to the topic. Purpose and objectives are scientifically appropriate. In "Introduction" are cited more than 7 authors. Individual sections of the manuscript are adequately represented. The findings are particularly valuable having in a mind importance of the crop studied. The conclusion is represented very closely.	First of all I would especially like to thank you for all the attention you put into the reading of my manuscript; you understood exactly the purpose of my work and the whole heart that I put in it, especially when it affects the food safety of your country. I would like also to thank you for your very pertinent and constructive comments.
Minor REVISION comments	However, some minor errors were noted: Line 86 - Line 94 "2-1-Goals:....." Usually aim of the study wrote in the introduction and before material and methods To synchronize the numbering of tables and figures Table 1 or Table 01 Fig 7 or Fig 07 Practically absent part "Discussion". In this respect, the manuscript must be strengthened.	You're right and it' has been done. Including discussion; I did not want to do very long so I had to simplify and put only the essential. Now I hope this will match your expectations.
Optional/General comments	Organization into sections and subsections was well done and paper structure is clear and arranged according to journal style. The proposed peer review manuscript, titled "Forage Resources in the Semi-Arid Region of Setif: Diagnosis and Status" is of interest.	