



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_31325
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECT OF GRAVITY VARIATION ON THE GROWTH OF WHEAT AND GUINEA CORN SEEDLINGS
Type of the 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 <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	Scientific names should be italicised. Keywords should not be in parenthesis. Much of the information and parameters studied are already available in literature, and as such, study provides little new information. Manuscript is poorly written, no in-text references and very poorly discussed. Discuss your results in terms of percentage. Clearly state what is new and the significant finding of this study. Include n value for each assay in each table and figure. Your discussion should be with statistical analysis i.e. in terms of significant alteration or otherwise Authors should focus on key findings rather than talking about specific parameters studied. Discussion needs to be more focused on major findings and should be thoroughly revised. A concluding sentence summarizing the major findings should be included. References 2 to 15 is not in text	I am very grateful to the Editor-in-Chief and the Reviewer for their time and effort. Thank you very much. I have revised the manuscript following the reviewer's recommendations. Thank you, Sir. The Scientific names have been italicised, the parenthesis in the keywords has been removed. The references have been properly inferred in the text and the concluding part has been added.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	There are some mistakes throughout the manuscript.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Finally, please consider having your paper reviewed by a native English speaker for language quality.	