



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_48342
Title of the Manuscript:	Yield and Characteristics of Melon Fruits Under Fertilization Management and Soil Cover
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:

(<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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>This article consists of 14 total pages, abstract and introduction 1 page, Materials and methods 2 pages, results discussion and conclusion 5 pages, reference 3,5 pages, The other Picture</p> <p>TITLE: Title is not very convenient</p> <p>Key Words: Suitable for this work</p> <p>Abstract: this study is summarized</p> <p>Introduction:.. this is enough for the study</p> <p>Materials and methods: How many parcels are in total? What is the size of parcel? sowing information, total area, used fertilizer quantities, information is missing. Also, the variance frequency table is missing.</p> <p>Results: The current results are explained.</p> <p>Conclusions: It needs to be slightly increased for work. What application should bring the benefits?</p> <p>REFERENCES. References is enough.</p> <p>Why this Study is made. Very inadequate to introduce the plant. this study is like a student's grade</p>	<p>There is an inconsistency in the reviewer's considerations as to the number of pages of our manuscript, the paper is composed of 19 pages, not 14 pages as mentioned. The page numbers described for the Materials and Methods, Results, Discussion and Conclusion sections are also different from those in the attached file. We kindly ask you to verify the submitted document.</p> <p>TITLE: We kept the title because we considered it to reflect the purpose of the work.</p> <p>Key Words: Ok.</p> <p>Abstract: Ok.</p> <p>Introduction: Ok.</p> <p>Materials and methods: The experiment is composed of 36 plots and this information was added to the manuscript. Each plot corresponds to a raised bed with seven plants, this information already appears in the text (lines 71 to 74). Information on sowing practices can be verified on lines 75-78; the amounts of fertilizers on lines 86-89 and organic and foliar fertilization specifications can be verified on lines 90-103. The Analysis of Variance table is presented as TABLE 1 and TABLE 2, on the lines 126 and 162.</p> <p>Results: Ok.</p> <p>Conclusions: We made changes in the Conclusions section, so that it is compatible with the proposed objectives.</p> <p>REFERENCES. Ok.</p>
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		



SDI Review Form 1.6

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>	No, there are not ethical issues in the manuscript.

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>