



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_45053
Title of the Manuscript:	Production of papaya seedlings using Spirulina platensis as a biostimulant applied on leaf and root
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>)

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 article is based on pot culture study. Title and abstract are appropriate to the study. Sufficient background information is given in introduction section with defined objective. Appropriate methods and procedures were followed. Results are presented in form of graphs, however some important parameters should be presented in tabular form with statistical analysis as per CRD. Discussion is scientific and supported by available evidences. Conclusion is sound having practical utility. References need revision as per the guidelines.	JUSTIFICATION Dear Editor, In referring to the observation on Figure 6 "The data on shoot length and root length should be given in tabular form with statistical analysis as per completely randomized design", the authors preferred to present the data as a polynomial regression graph in reason of significant effect and the reasonable adjustment of the quadratic function. In this figure there is no data on shoot length. The data on shoot length (plant height) were presented in Figure 1C (first experiment) and Figure 4C (second experiment). In addition, the authors intended standardization in the presentation of data. We inform you that we are available for any clarification on this justification.
Minor REVISION comments	Indicated in the manuscript.	They were done in the text.
Optional/General comments	Data on shoot and root length should be presented in tabular form with statistical analysis as per CRD.	The justification is written previously. We use the units according to International System of Units throughout text. So we believe that they are uniform.

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	there are no ethical issues in this manuscript

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link: <http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>