



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Experimental Agriculture International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_48918
Title of the Manuscript:	Growth, development and quality of eucalyptus seedling using fish farming wastewater fertigation
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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p>Authors have studied the reuse of fish wastewater in agricultural activities such as the production of seedlings in commercial nurseries has great potential to minimize production costs and to reduce environmental impacts due to the inappropriate disposal of this waste. The objective of this study was to evaluate the growth, development and quality of <i>Eucalyptus grandis</i> W. Hill ex Maiden seedlings produced with different wastewater concentrations from fish farming.</p> <p>Authors found that the nutrient contents present in the leaf tissue were adequate for the nutritional demand of the eucalyptus. The seedling quality index (DQI) indicated that the daily nutrient solution (0.21) and 50% FW + 50% DNS (0.20) generated balanced seedlings regarding height and biomass accumulation.</p> <p>The study is very interesting and manuscript is almost structured properly.</p> <p><b>Following Explanations are needed-</b></p> <p><b>PAGE 2: 2. MATERIAL AND METHODS</b> <i>is to be replaced as: 2. MATERIAL AND METHODOLOGY</i></p> <p><b>PAGE12: 4. CONCLUSION</b> <i>is to be re-written with point wise.</i></p>	<p>We agree, corrections were made in the manuscript.</p> <p>The conclusion is in agreement with the objectives of the manuscript and the corrections were made in the manuscript</p>
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<p>Manuscript is interesting and structured properly, but need to be improvised linguistically.</p> <p>The review manuscript is recommended for publication after incorporating above suggestion / comments.</p>	<p>The manuscript has been translated and revised by Canadian English teacher, professional, editor and translator, attached certificate attached.</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<u><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></u>	