



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_41523
Title of the Manuscript:	Solanum melongena ecophysiology under the influence of Meloidogyne javanica
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	Abstract I suggest an English reviewer assist in reviewing the article prior to publication. The article is unreadable since there is no proper sentence construction, which makes it very difficult to understand. Authors did not mention any of their treatments and that makes the whole study irrelevant. The use of the two words resistant and Tolerance interchangeably indicated that the authors have no clear understanding of the two words. Cultivars that are resistant completely differs with tolerant cultivars in terms of handling high nematode population densities. Also, the authors talks about the plant being resistant to applied nematode levels, however, there is no indication of how many nematodes applied per plant, i.e. initial population (Pi). Introduction Problem statement not clearly stated. The damage caused by the root-knot nematodes in the test crop not well captured in terms of yield loss, which answers the question, what is the problem. Authors did not address properly who is affected by what they presume the problem in their study. Also, authors used the word 'knots' to refer to the root-knot nematodes, I wonder whether authors are nematologists or not. I request that a Plant Nematologist assist in reviewing the paper or even look at the nematode data prior to submission. Materials and methods. Treatments layout and experimental design not properly presented. This becomes a major challenge since the study cannot be repeated by anyone anywhere.	- All the text passed by linguistic revision by qualified company, as follows the attached proof. - The wrong terms (tolerance and resistance) have been corrected. - 6000 nematodes per pot were used (experimental unit). - As the yield of the culture used was not evaluated, but the gas exchanges and growth, the authors chose to describe and highlight these issues. The team is formed by a nematologist, plant physiologist and phytotechnologists, however, when translating the article, the company responsible did not use the correct term (root-knot). However, this has been corrected throughout the text. - The experimental design was presented correctly and, we emphasize, that this experiment could be repeated. (The experimental design has completely randomized with two groups of plants (with and without soil infestation) with five replications and two plants per pot.)
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		