

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Agriculture and Ecology Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAERI_116381
Title of the Manuscript:	The influence of container and frigo planting material on the vegetative growth and fertility of the variety Clery
Type of the Article	

Review Form 1.7

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 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The subject matter in terms of how storage/preparation of planting material affects the performance of plants and crop is an important area of research and in that sense the manuscript is of scientific importance.• The title can be improved to be more palatable to an international audience by making it explicit that the crop is strawberry. As an example, "<i>Effect of planting material on the growth of the Clefy variety of strawberries</i>"• The abstract needs improvement as it lacks a succinct description of the experimental design and layout. It also lacks the statistics necessary to indicate the significance of the findings.• Yes, the sub-sections are appropriate though there should have been a sub-section dedicated to Recommendations or Conclusion and recommendations.• Inconclusive. This is because the article does not prove enough evidence to support it findings.• The author only cited one reference in the body of the manuscript but has 20 references in the Reference list which is wrong. The references are dated, averaging 19 years old.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	No. The quality of English needs improvement for clarity. The author should have been more explicit in describing the planting material and should also have been consistent in the way they referred to them. As an example, the author should not have alternated between "container seedlings" and "green container seedlings". This gave the impression that these were different things.	
Optional/General comments	The article lacks scientific rigour especially considering it is an experiment. The author leaves out a lot of detail that is necessary to make an informed judgement of the findings. There should have been a detailed description of the experimental design, its layout and replication used. Since it was a field experiment, how were the differences in soil type, slopes etc. treated? Detail on how the data was collected also needed to be described more explicitly. For example, were the same plants measured? How were the plants selected? And so on. There should be a clear description of the data analyses done and the software(s) used to carry out those analyses.	

Review Form 1.7

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:	Sammie Batanai Lovemore
Department, University & Country	Midlands State University, Zimbabwe