



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_36984
Title of the Manuscript:	Alternative substrates for production of tomato seedlings of the cherry group
Type of the Article	Short Research Articles

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 <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>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	1] The last and last but one sentences in the abstracts looks long and winding. Authors must rework on both sentences to present the outcome of the experiment and conclusion arrived at based on the results obtained. 2] Authors must clearly show in the introduction part the gap in literature that merited the study. Or still, what new knowledge will the study add to world knowledge? 3] In the introduction the authors failed to establish the link between substrates and the growth parameters used in the study. Authors must be able to review some examples of the use of alternative substrates in some other crops and how it affected the measurable growth parameters in those studies. 4] Statement at lines 24-26 need to supported by current reference. The production figures are current figures, however the reference [3] which is dated 2006 can support the current claim. For instance production value for China in tomatoes as at 2006 will not be 52 million tonnes. Authors can use current FOASTAT figures and reference. 5] Statement on line 45 must be reworked on. It is not clear what the author want to present.	1] The part of the results and discussion has been improved and the conclusion of the abstract. 2] Corrected. 3] Corrected. 4] There was a misunderstanding regarding this reference, and this information from the FAO database. 5] The part in question has been amended.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1] Words in the title sentence should be used as Key words. 2] Authors must used the services of a professional proof reader to correct the minor minor grammatical errors in the	1] Attended. 2] Attended.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	manuscript.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	1] A change of title may be necessary. Alternate title should be : Alternative substrates for production of cherry tomato seedlings	1] Attended.