

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Experimental Agriculture International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_84560
Title of the Manuscript:	Interactive effects of moisture content and packaging material on common bean seed yield and yield components
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:

(<https://www.journaljeai.com/index.php/JEAI/editorial-policy> )

### 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p>The manuscript describes the influence of seed moisture and packaging material on the common <i>Ennepa</i> (white seed) bean variety in Ghana. By assessing the degree of variation of many biometric and physiological indicators, the results obtained allow the authors to draw correct and relevant conclusions.</p> <p>Generally, the article is well written, but it contains some minor errors that need to be corrected for publication in the Journal of Experimental Agriculture International.</p> <p>Thus, there are two spaces between some words.</p> <p>The References chapter needs to be revised carefully because sometimes the authors of this manuscript put a comma after the authors' names, sometimes not. Also, the year is placed between parentheses, but it is written again (with or without indication of the month of publication) at the end of some references.</p> <p>Use uniform notation for pages, pp. or p. I suggest you use pp.</p> <p>Additional suggestions are made directly in the manuscript (in line).</p>	<p>Revised to reflect suggestions</p> <p>References revised taking into consideration both reviewers comments.</p>
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

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