



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_47910
Title of the Manuscript:	Yield and Physical Quality of the Yellow Passion Fruit under Spacing within Plants and Water Salinity
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	<p>Good and relatively innovative original research paper fit for publication by JEAI. However, the following evaluations should be taken into consideration before the paper is considered for publication.</p> <p>First and foremost, the methodology should be divided into sub-sections like location of study area, data collection procedure and data analysis procedure. This will ease comprehension and make replicability easier for other researchers wishing to conduct similar studies.</p> <p>Last but not the least the Results and Discussion sections should also be divided into sub-sections in accordance with the specific objectives of the study. This will ease understanding, thereby broadening the reach of the paper's findings.</p>	The 'Materials and Methods' section was subdivided into three sub-sections: 2.1 Plant Material and Growing Conditions, 2.2 Treatments and Experimental Design, and 2.3 Evaluations and Statistical Analysis. The 'Results' section was subdivided into four sub-sections: 3.1 Fruit Yield and Fruit Mass, 3.2 Longitudinal and Transversal Diameter, 3.3 Pulp Yield, and 3.4 Peel Mass and Thickness. The 'Discussion' section was not subdivided because the results for the studied variables are discussed in an integrated manner.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	A good and relatively innovative paper almost ripe for publication. However, the points highlighted above should be taken into consideration before the paper is considered for publication.	We performed all the requested corrections.

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)	No, there are not ethical issues in the manuscript.