



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_45019
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECT OF PESTICIDE ON VEGETATIVE GROWTH AND FRUIT YIELD OF MANDARIN CITRUS SEEDLESS IN BASIC DESIGN PERIOD AT THAI NGUYEN PROVINCE
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 (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	Lines 5 (carry instead of carried, line 11(has instead of have, enhanced for enhancing). Line 20 (have instead of has), line 38 (pesticide not pesticie), 42(was not were). 43(evaluated). 44(was not were). 45 (were). 46 ('were' determined; TSS 'was'). Line 50 (0.05 is alpha value (α) and not p-value because some p values are greater than (> 0.05) that value in your table.56 ('difference in'). 58(probability sign < contradicts the Table1 and its interpretation). 59 ('difference in' there is significant difference in plant height and no. Branch level2 whereas, it is not significant in tree canopy diameter as seen in p-values in Table 1). 64($p < 0.05$ contradict Table 1 and wrong interpretation-see general comments). 67(48.00 not 48.44 in Table 1). 74 (p sign reversed from table 2, no adequate interpretation. 79(Table?). 90(p wrongly explained i.e. significant in 2018 but not significant in 2017). 91(delete 'in which'). 110(wrong sign of p as compared to that on Table 3, wrong interpretation). 111('significantly' should be reviewed). 115(Table?, add 'in' before leaves). 127 (133.4g is not in the Table). 129 (124.3g/fruit is not in Table4). 140 (which Table?). 144 (T2 & T3-peel fruit weight, figures are inconsistent with others).	All corrections have been effected in the revised manuscript Authors very much appreciate the comments of the reviewers. We tried to improve the quality of the manuscript based on the thoughtful comments of the reviewers.
Minor REVISION comments	Line 17: delete K .reference (1) as cited within the text. References were not cited in the work, especially discussion to compare other works except in introduction only, number of references were so limited and inconsistent arrangement. lines 21-22 (all % should be spaced from figures e.g 22 %). Line 34 (2017 to 2018, which months?). 39(motorized spray not sprayed). Any reason for these observations in lines118?. Table 4 (T2 & T3 under fruit weight differ much in significant figures or decimal places).127 (in term "(s) of"). 131-132(the lowest & highest values should be to two decimal places as others).142 (8.50).significant figures in Table 4 are not consistent. line 147(enhanced not enhancing).	Corrections have been implemented in the revised MS
Optional/General comments	Note that: if $p \leq 0.05$ (α -value) then it is significant i.e. has significant difference; if $p > 0.05$ (α -value), it is not significant. The signs were misinterpreted in Tables 1.2 and 3 as in the discussion parts. All punctuations for SD values are not correct, they carry coma instead of full stop i.e. SD= ± 0.01 instead of 0.01). All α or p-values take coma instead of a full stop i.e. $\alpha=0.05$).References 157&160 page nos. Are not necessary since they are journals, 163 & 166 are not consistent by adding year at the end, should not be so if 'APA' system is employed. The discussion was so parochial as no comparison was attempted with any other relevant research and suitable reasons for certain observations were hardly given in discussion which give rise the conclusion. It could be published if the corrections are taken into consideration.	Corrected

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)	