



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Experimental Agriculture International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_47911
Title of the Manuscript:	Influence of hypometry in the occupation of semiarid areas
Type of the Article	<u>Original Research Article</u>

**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>)

**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	<p><b>Good original research paper fit for publication by JEAI. However the following points should be taken into consideration.</b></p> <p><b>Introduction too superficial. Just three authors referenced. More should be done to bring the introduction to standard by soughting for and citing more up-to-date research papers.</b></p> <p><b>The methodology is good. Very concise and precise. The results should be divided into sub-sections in accordance with the specific objectives of the study. This will ease comprehension. And the discussion of findings should be done in a more comparative fashion in order to better compare and contrast the findings of this paper with what has been found elsewhere in related studies.</b></p>	<p>The comments were accepted.</p> <p>Except for the 1960 reference, they are the ones that base the intervals. The methodology was based on these intervals, so I can't change it.</p> <p>The manuscript was verified by native in English.</p>
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p>The language needs a bit of polishing to bring it up to standard.</p> <p>The most recent research works (2013 – 2018) related to the paper should be sought for and cited in the paper in order to give the paper more relevance in today's context. Citing papers dating to as far back as 1960 does not do justice to the study.</p>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<p>A good original research paper that is almost ready for publication. But the aforementioned corrections should be taken into consideration before the paper is considered for publication.</p>	

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