



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_48842
Title of the Manuscript:	GERMINATION IN VITRO DE JABUTICABEIRA <i>Myrciaria jaboticaba</i> (VELL.) BERG
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>Good original research paper very much fit for publication by JEAI. However, the following points should be looked into before the paper is considered for publication.</p> <p>First and foremost, the geographical coordinates (latitude and longitude) of the area under study should be imperatively highlighted.</p> <p>Secondly, the data analysis procedure should be well explained and the rationale underlying the use of the statistical analysis software given.</p> <p>Thirdly, the results and discussion section should be divided into different sub-sections following the specific objectives of the study. This will ease comprehension of the findings of the study.</p> <p>Equally, the discussion of the findings of the study should be done in a more comparative fashion i.e. the findings of the study should be compared and contrasted with the findings of other authors who have conducted related research in other parts of the world. This should be done by using the latest publications (2014 – 2019) in the domain in order to give the findings of the study more relevance and depth. Moreover, it is imperative for the author(s) of the paper to provide plausible justifications for the findings of the study and not merely describing the findings.</p> <p>Last but not the least an insightful conclusion should be given and the possible practical and policy implications of the study should be highlighted.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>More recent scientific papers (2014 – 2019) related to the paper should be sought for and used at the level of the introduction as well as in discussing the findings of the paper. This will make the paper more scientifically rigorous.</p>	
Optional/General comments	<p>Good original research paper that could be considered for publication. However, the aforementioned comments and evaluations should be taken into account 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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Nyong Princely Awazi</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>University of Dschang, Cameroon</i>