



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Experimental Agriculture International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_46082
Title of the Manuscript:	Growth and Production of Watermelon Grown Under Seaweed Extract
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	I suggest that manuscript conclusions should be extended. Please provide some more information about obtained results, for example the concrete impact of treatments on the observed variables: plant height, fresh shoot weight and fresh root weight.	- The proposed requests were met. Thank you!
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	-	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The manuscript is well written. Provides some new information about different use of biostimulators (Acadian treatment) on the watermelon seeds with the aim of faster plant growth and overall increase of some morphological characteristic. The materials and methods are well described, provides all necessary information for the experiment to be repeated. Also, the results are informative, clearly written and followed by a well-used statistical methods. Comments for the conclusion I wrote in previous part.	

**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)	