



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Experimental Agriculture International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_48848
Title of the Manuscript:	DIFFERENT LIGHT RADIATION INTENSITIES ON COTTON: A PHYSIOLOGICAL APPROACH
Type of the Article	Original Research Paper

**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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>Good paper very much fit for publication by JEA. However, much needs to be done to bring the paper up to publication standard.</p> <p>First and foremost, the paper needs to be better articulated. There are a lot of language and syntax errors in the paper which need to be rectified before the paper can be considered for publication. This is of the essence because poor articulation of ideas makes the paper incomprehensible. The paper should therefore be given to someone with a good mastery of the English language to read through and correct all the language errors.</p> <p>Secondly, the methodology of the study is too superficial which does not permit repeatability/replicability. It is of the essence to add more flesh to the methodology section in order to permit replicability. Equally, the materials and methods section should be sub-divided into: the study area; data collection procedure; and data analysis procedure. This will ease comprehension.</p> <p>Thirdly, a justification should be provided for the findings of the paper. It doesn't suffice to just describe the findings of the paper. The results section should also be divided into different sub-sections following the specific objectives of the study. This will go a long way to ease comprehension of the study's findings.</p> <p>Equally, the discussion of the study's findings should be done in a more comparative fashion i.e. comparing and contrasting the findings of the study with the findings of other authors. More scientific publications (especially the most recent i.e. 2014 – 2019), should be sought for and used to discuss the findings of the paper.</p> <p>Last but not the least, the practical and policy implications of the study should be given in order to help policy makers and other stakeholders orientate and re-orientate their decision making processes.</p>	<p>The changes were made as requested.</p> <p>The changes then highlighted with the yellow color.</p>
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	The abstract needs to be looked into again. In the present abstract, the study's findings are not well portrayed. This should be critically looked into.	The changes were made as requested.
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Good original research paper that could be considered for publication by JEA. However, the aforementioned comments should be taken into account before the paper is considered for publication.	The changes were made as requested.

**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)	