

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_126955
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Seaweed extract and Humic acid treatment on the phenological and yield characteristics of guava (Psidium guajava L.)
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>
Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	1-The manuscript idea is very novel regarding the study of the Effect of Seaweed extract and Humic acid treatment on the phenological and yield characteristics of guava. 2-The abstract is enough and clear. 3-Introduction sufficient and contains a review literature of seaweed and humic acid	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	No, no addition or deletion.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	1-In materials and methods is the 25 shoots for each tree or for each experimental unit. 2-Is flowers droup consider as fruits droup? 3- results: many words need to be deleted. 4-There is something not correct in the data of Table 1	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Yes	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

PART 2:

	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>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Abdel-monnem Sadalaha Khalel
Department, University & Country	Technical Agricultural College, Iraq