



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_40514
Title of the Manuscript:	Growth, yield and phytochemical characterization of small watermelon varieties in hydroponics
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	I have reviewed the manuscript entitled "Growth, yield and phytochemical characterization of small watermelon varieties in hydroponics". Generally, the present study is very interesting and suitable for this journal. This work appears to have been logically planned and I recommend the manuscript for publication after major adjustments have been taken into account. The results appear to be valid and the methodology is appropriate. The authors make a systematic contribution to the research literature in this area of investigation and sufficient numbers of references have been cited in discussion to support their findings. However, there are a few specific issues the authors should address by making modifications to the manuscript prior to consider for publication. 1. Sentences are not clear and concise throughout the manuscript. e.g., L107: The varieties plant growth was similar (Table 1). 2. Abstract that is not persuasive 3. Poor grammar 4. The major comment is English in the manuscript needs thorough polishing. Correct the following points: 5. Consider to reconstruct the abstract, results and discussion parts. 6. Kindly use an appropriate terminology or words. E.g., in abstract yield were achieved. Replace the word achieved with attained. 7. L20: Scientific name must be italic. 8. It would be more appropriate to have sub heading/ subsection for materials and methodology and result and discussion parts. 9. Kindly check the statistical analysis-mean comparison data (Table 1 & 2). State it correctly.	We hope to have taken care of all the requests made: 1. Improved. 2. Improved. 3. Improved. 4. Improved. 5. Was reconstructed. 6. Improved. 7. Done. 8. Done and improved. 9. Data and statistical analysis were reviewed and no errors were found. Thanks for the time you have given and the considerations on the article.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	This topic is interesting to the readers, however revision is highly required. My general suggestion is the authors are request to improve the English and poor grammar of this manuscript to enhance the scientific quality of this journal and also for consideration of publication.	