



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_48625
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of Physiological Quality of Seeds of Improved Snap Bean Lines under Different Storage
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	This paper was concerned with Evaluation of Physiological Quality of Seeds of Improved Snap Bean Lines under Different Storage , which was conducted by traditional methodology and the content of which is better. Major revisions must be made as below: 1. Introduction: need to review specific and recent literature on the topic of research. Don't use plagiarized material and old references. 2. The recent related progress in the field was not introduced well in combination with the recent references; 3. In this manuscript not follow author guideline in the reference list 4. More important/recent references can be added to the manuscript; 5. Major problem with references	Unfortunately, in Brazil, we have a big problem with the bibliographical update with the crop. For, in addition to being cultivated by small-scale farmers, research is still small, so the references are, in general, quotations from our own research group and, unfortunately, somewhat old.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General 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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	