Review Form 3

Journal Name:	**Journal of Experimental Agriculture International**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JEAI_123715**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Growth and Economic Return of Quinoa (Chenopodium quinoa Willd.) under Different Plant Spacing and Fertility Conditions**
Type of the Article	

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	**Reviewer's comment**	**Author's Feedback** *(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)*
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.	The authors of this manuscript have an ambitious objective and draw on an interesting dataset. I thoroughly enjoyed reading this manuscript, and I believe it has a lot of promises. The objectives that this written work sets for handling and discussing a highly important topic are remarkable. The manuscript has been effectively written, well organized, and categorized with information. The study's determinations reflect logic and are persuasive. The work presents an original contribution and is supported by strong experimental data.	
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.	The abstract, introduction, discussion and conclusion were poorly written.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	**The introduction's scientific claims and the organization's structure have been shown to be perfect, and they are deeply supported by recent references. Due to the availability of the specified detailed information on the results obtained from this research compared to those from earlier research studies, the reader is able to comprehend the concept and techniques of the current study.**	
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.	**In my opinion, the authors cannot make their current claims without considering their writings. In addition, I noticed a lot of points that require the writers' careful consideration: the discussion that took place was extremely disorganized and useless. The theoretical framework is promising but incomplete. Furthermore, I observed a few issues that the writers should give careful consideration to the following: The details of all the figures and tables were not easily understandable. You should improve the labels and captures of your schematics and tables because it is difficult to understand all of the complex procedures and specific details.**	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. **-**	**The reference list is inadequate and out-of-date.**	
Minor REVISION comments **Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**	There are occasions when this manuscript's language and sentence structures are unintelligible. This article requires extensive language editing and a complete rewrite. Throughout the text, there are several verbs and phrases that are repeated.	
Optional/General comments	All of the proposed scientific experiments are thoroughly explained which is fully supported by recent references. I propose that this original work be accepted after minor adjustments have been made. There are occasions when this manuscript's language and sentence structures are unintelligible. This article requires extensive language editing and a complete rewrite. Throughout the text, there are several verbs and phrases that are repeated.	

Review Form 3

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)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Shahira H. EL-Moslamy**
Department, University & Country	**Genetic Engineering and Biotechnology Research Institute, City of Scientific Research and Technological Applications, Egypt**